OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE:
A SCALE OF OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE IN NEW ZEALAND

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Arts in Psychology

in the

University of Canterbury

by

Monica J. Montague-Brown

University of Canterbury

1976

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This thesis is in the area of prestige and in particular occupational prestige in New Zealand. The literature review covers the concept of prestige and its meaning in sociology, the position of the concept of prestige and in particular occupational prestige in sociological theory, the major empirical studies of occupational prestige and their findings, the underlying factors prestige scales measure, sex variation in occupational prestige ratings, and the prestige scales which have been developed in New Zealand. A sample of 150 undergraduate students were employed to rate 40 occupations according to their social standing and also according to what they think the social standing of occupations ought to be. There were 373 occupations from which the 40 occupations for each respondent were sampled, and female occupations were included. Two rating scales, one for actual and one for ideal scales resulted and were found to correlate highly with other prestige scales in New Zealand. A replication of a four-dimensional study by Goldthorpe and Hope (1972) was carried out and the same 40 occupations were rated by 25 undergraduate students in sociology according to each of the following dimensions: standard of living, power and influence, qualifications, and value to society. All intercorrelations of these dimensions were significant at the 0.0001 level except for the correlations of value to society, significant at the 0.001 level.

Among other findings with regard to the first study were, in the case of the occupations which have incumbents of both self-employed and not self-employed status, those who are self-employed were rated higher on the 7 point scale than those who are not self-employed and for business

owners whose business is of higher value were rated more highly than those whose business is of lower value. Males and females rated occupations differently and respondents rated occupations differently according to their ideal status from ratings according to actual status. The status of lower white collar occupations was found to be equal to that of the upper blue-collar occupations. Professional occupations have increased in status since the Congalton-Havighurst study and farming occupations have retained the same status.

Through looking at ideal and actual status it was found that the Marxist or conflict theory is more feasible; however that respondents were able to order their ratings in a gradated series rather than dichotomize their ratings as Marxist theory would suggest the Marxian argument is not totally supported.

I. INTRODUCTION

This thesis was designed to explore the area of prestige and in particular the prestige of occupation, both male and female, in New Zealand. A comprehensive review of the literature relating to the following areas has been prepared. In Chapter 1, the concept of prestige and its meaning in sociology is discussed, and this paves the way for, and places into context sociologically, the next chapter of the literature review, that dealing with position of the concept of prestige and in particular occupational prestige in thoery. At this point, in Chapter III, the major empirical studies of occupational prestige and their findings are discussed, which then leads to the question of the underlying factors prestige scales might be measuring. Next, in Section 3, the question of whether there is a sex variation in occupational prestige ratings is researched. Then to provide the background literature to the research, prestige scales which have been developed in New Zealand are discussed. Chapter IV covers the research problems, hypotheses put forward and the research design. Chapter V contains the results of the research and the testing of the hypotheses. The final chapter is a discussion of the results, the conclusions which have been made, a discussion of what the research has achieved and finally a look at possible further research. The format is such that at the end of each chapter of the literature review there is a summary of the contents.

II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

1. The Concept of Prestige and its Meaning in Sociology

Before examining the meaning of prestige in sociology, it is useful to look at the usual use and meaning of the term. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines prestige as "social position, rank, relation to others, relative importance". The definitions of status and prestige in the dictionary appear somewhat different. In sociology, however, the two terms are used interchangeably. However, the dictionary definition to a certain extent resembles the distinction Parkin (1971) makes between status as a reputational attribute of persons, and status as a formal attribute of positions, and this will be discussed in more detail later.

The Dictionary of the Social Sciences (1964) defines the terms status and prestige in such a way that they could be used interchangeably.

Status is defined according to its use in modern society and it is said to denote:

a) position in the social system involving reciprocal expectation of action with respect to occupants of other positions in the same structure;

b) place with respect to the distribution of prestige within a social system, and sometimes, by implication, with respect to the distribution of rights, obligations, power and authority within the same system - as in the phrases high status, low status;

c) high place with respect to the distribution of prestige within a social system - as in the phrase status seeker.

It is pointed out that status is essentially a legal term and connotes the sum of the legal capacities of an individual. Linton is quoted as choosing status to mean the place of an individual in society and defined it as "a collection of rights and duties" with role defined as the putting into action of these rights and duties.

Status is sometimes used as a synonym for prestige or honour, and by loose implication is sometimes used to denote power, authority, rights and obligations associated with prestige. For Weber the concepts class and status were closely related but in recent usage, the concept of status has tended to become divorced from the concept of class and to centre on the struggle for prestige within the middle class, thus avoiding the problems of the relationship between class and status. In this usage status denotes high place on the prestige continuum.

Prestige, in the Dictionary of the Social Sciences, is defined as follows:

Prestige denotes in general the influence (high or low) exercised by individuals, groups, institutions, pursuits, and artifacts, and/or the standing (high or low) enjoyed by such individuals, groups, etc.

The sociological usage of prestige has denoted an influence cast over others either legitimately by the demonstration of superior attainments, or illegitimately by a parade of attainments (or powers, or possessions) not actually possessed. Max Weber

wrote of the feeling of prestige conferred by the possession of talents even when they were unused and of the prestige interests of different orders of society being furthered by fashion and conventions. The word prestige is currently used much more widely with a looser meaning of the social standing of persons or classes in a stratified society. Issues relevant to the legitimacy or illegitimacy of prestige have tended to disappear from the technical meaning, and with it the meaning of prestige as influence over others.

In recent literature, prestige denotes the evaluation accorded to persons, groups or classes in so far as they are ranked invidiously by each other and by society at large. The Dictionary also includes a discussion of the bases on which various people raise prestige claims and the reasons others honour these claims. These bases include property and birth, occupation and education, income and power - in fact almost anything that may invidiously distinguish one person from another. In the status system of a society these claims are organised as rules and expectations which regulate who successfully claims prestige, from whom, in what ways, and on what basis. The level of self-esteem enjoyed by individuals is more or less set by this status system.

In sociology, there appear to be different usages of the term status and Linton (1936) distinguishes three of these. Status can be used in the abstract to mean a position in a particular pattern of reciprocal behaviour between persons or groups of people. A second usage

of the term is where status refers to the sum total of all statuses which a person occupies, that is his or her position in relation to the whole of society. A third usage, is status as distinct from the person who occupies it and as a collection of rights and duties. Status is also viewed in terms of the way in which it functions in society. Park and Burgess (1921) for example, regard status as a process and as such they describe how it functions, saying that it acts as a stabiliser in that it works to avoid continual readjustment and change in the social structure, at the same time giving power to the social structure.

Parkin, in discussing the present use of the term social status maintains that insufficient distinction between status as a reputational attribute of persons, and status as a formal attribute of positions, is drawn. The former status arises on the basis of interraction in face-to-face situations. The latter use of the term status describes the system of ranked positions which constitutes the national prestige structure. In so far as the study of social stratification is primarily concerned with the formal properties of the system of inequalities, then it is status as an attribute of positions, not persons, that must occupy the attention of the sociologist. Parkin states that the national prestige structure cannot be viewed as an amalgam of the reputational qualities of individuals in social settings and it is quite independent of small-scale interraction processes since it is a different phenomenon.

In sociology, status has been traditionally regarded as a way of behaviour, involving notions of deference, acceptance and derogation.[1] However, with regard to occupational prestige or status, the traditional view of status does not appear to be entirely appropriate. Goldthorpe and Hope (1974) see occupational 'prestige' grading exercises as

representing a synthetic and emergent judgement from the population concerned, a judgement which is indicative of what might be called the 'general goodness' or a term they prefer, the 'general desirability' of occupations. Featherman, Jones and Hauser (1975) agree with this interpretation of the emergent prestige ranking as a hierarchy of desirability rather than of prestige, in its strictly interpreted traditional or classical sense. The reason Featherman et al. agree with Goldthorpe and Hope is because, they say, the social organisation of modern capitalist societies may preclude normatively prescribed prestige groups (that is, symbolically legitimated groups with patterned relationships of deference, acceptance, and derogation) except at the most microsocial levels. This is in line with Parkin's view that the national prestige structure is independent of small-scale interraction processes.

Social stratification theories in sociology employ the concept of status to a large degree. In theories of social stratification a concern for the subjective, consensual or evaluative basis of social prestige ranking - said to be an important dimension of stratification - appears to characterise a theoretical approach which highlights the functional linking of elements of society rather than any dissensions which might exist. Well known examples of such a theoretical approach are the writings of Davis and Moore (1949) and those of Parsons (1964). Conversely, a concern for the distributions of inequalities which are economically based and related to unequal distributions of positions or power within a productive system or market, respectively, is characteristic of a theoretical approach which views society in terms of disparate rather than shared interests. An example of such a theoretical approach is provided by the writings of Marx (1975).

Theories and discussions of social stratification can be seen to cluster around certain points; the reality of stratification as an

objective aspect of one's experience and as related to one's location in the economic process; or the reality of stratification as a subjective aspect, as a way of ordering and classifying the views and evaluations which people have and make about positions within society. The concept of prestige falls into the latter of the two recurring interest areas and it is this concept which will be of prime concern in the discussion to come and which was the basis of the research reported in this thesis.

Of major interest to theorists and also the basis of much disagreement among them, is concern about the nature and the determinants of stratification. Out of this disagreement has emerged different uses of the notions of prestige and status. In much of the prestige related writings it is not always easy to separate views concerned with the nature of prestige from those concerned with the determinants of prestige. Most theorists have concentrated mainly on the latter aspect.

It is useful to look at what the major theorists in sociology have had to say about the concept of prestige. Marx (1975) in his writings on class referred little to the concept and formed no detailed theory in this area. However, in distinguishing between those who have power and those who do not - on the basis of their relation to the means of production and the productive process - Marx did introduce the notion of status. The assumption was made that those who were powerful also had prestige and that the status system arises out of the evaluations of the powerful dominant class members.

One of the criticisms of Marx's theory of class and class conflict is that put forward by Weber (1958). He argued that there are distinct dimensions of social stratification, class[2], status, and parties[3], which, although separable conceptually, can relate to each other in a number of ways. In Weber's case status is used to refer to the existence within many different societies of an unequal distribution of social honour.

Social honour is seen as being accorded by members of society to people, occupations, and styles of life and consumption patterns. The distribution of social honour is regarded as being closely related to class but at the same time able to vary independently of it. Social honour was viewed as a claim to positive and to negative right with respect to prestige. Weber saw social prestige as being based on one or more of the following: mode of living, formal process of education, the actual 'rational' training and the acquisition of the corresponding modes of life, on the prestige of birth, and/or on the prestige of occupation.

In relation to the concept of class, Weber distinguished between "status groups" and "classes", the former being stratified on the basis of the members' consumption of goods, and the latter being stratified according to the members' relation to the production and buying of goods. The relationships of status and class are regarded as being complex and varied and are said to arise out of the historical development of status groups. The development of theory in relation to status and class owes a lot to the writings of Weber.

Another theorist to make contributions to the area of prestige was Parsons (1964, 1970). While recognising the importance of the usefulness of the Marxist approach as a way of understanding stratification, Parsons, unlike Marx, placed emphasis on the way in which stratification is said to bring together and order society and the social processes within it. Stratification is seen to involve the distribution and allocation of social honour by members of a society and the overall structure of the system is said to be ranked in a gradated series of strata rather than being dichotomous, as in the case of Marxist theory. For Parsons the heirarchical nature of the system he proposes involves two parts. First the division of labour is said to involve different skills and abilities which in turn demand training and selection. Second, the

organisation of the division of labour involves a hierarchy; people in different positions within this structure are said to have different statuses. As a point of interest, along with the differential evaluation of occupational positions in society, Parsons included in the analysis of stratification, an element which is based on an historical continuity, and this is the family.

The use of the major concepts by these theorists can be summarized as follows. The notion of class and status are closely related empirically, although different emphases have been placed on the effects of unequal distribution of status and the determinants of this inequality. Class can be seen to refer to the inequalities of the distribution of resources (economic, power, and life chances) while status is based on some sort of consensus about, for example, qualities, achievements, and possessions which are thought to deserve esteem and admiration[4].

Whether or not the differences in class or status can be explained by one or other of the two theoretical orientations discussed,[5] appears to depend on the amount of consensus (or alternatively dissensus) present with regard to the evaluation of prestige of positions within society. In a sense, any consensus could be 'engineered' by society through socialisation process in order that the status quo be maintained and this could be reflected in people's evaluations. On the basis of the Marxist argument, little consensus concerning prestige would be expected and from the functional point of view, a high degree of consensus would be expected. However most studies in the area of occupational prestige have just examined the ordering of the occupations without investigating the consensus/dissensus distinction. Kemper (1976) argues that a more appropriate test of the two approaches can be made by looking at a different question. This involves the distinction between what the prestiges of positions are as viewed by the community or society and the evaluation of what the prestiges of positions ought to be, i.e. a kind of ideal ordering. There may be a

high degree of consensus as to the prestige ordering seen to exist. This would not indicate support for one theory over the other, but would simply be a statement of the order of positions in society. At the same time there may be little consensus as to what the allocation of prestige ought to be. If there was little consensus about what the prestige ordering of occupations ought to be, or if the ordering of occupations along these lines differed from an ordering according to the actual status of occupations in the society and there was agreement about this difference, then it would indicate support for conflict theory (the Marxist approach).

In relation to stratification and prestige, more recently Parkin (1971) discussed the multi-dimensional theory, said to have its origins in the writings of Weber. There are said to be many sources of inequality in modern society, each source being independent of the others. The stratification order is regarded as having 'rank dimensions', such as occupation, ethnic status, education, income, religion and sex. Each person is said to occupy a rank on each of the different dimensions. Another school of theorists posits that in modern society other dimensions of stratification become subordinated to and therefore highly correlated with the occupational hierarchy. This theory is referred to as industrial convergence theory, since the convergence of stratification systems (such as occupation, ethnic status, etc.) is stressed, and social ranking is regarded as being unidimensional and this is believed to result from industrialisation.

There are common bases to these two theories, however. Both are based on the school of thought which separates both conceptually and empirically the various dimensions along which societies are said to be stratified. In the case of the multi-dimensional approach the notions of 'class', 'status' and 'power' are less associated.

It seems from the literature concerning the concept of prestige and its meaning in sociology, that the words status and prestige appear to be used interchangeably. There are differing usages of the terms. Status and prestige can be used in the abstract and refer to the sum of all statuses a person occupies as well as to represent a collection of rights and duties. Status can be regarded as a process and as such its functions can be discussed. It is important to distinguish between status as a reputational attribute of persons and status as a formal attribute of positions. Traditionally in sociology, status has been regarded as behaviour, involving notions of deference, acceptance and derogation. With regard to occupational prestige studies, however, the 'general desirability' of occupations is a preferred term to status or prestige of occupations, since the social organisation of modern societies may preclude normatively prescribed prestige groups with patterned relationships of deference etc., except at microsocial levels. However, 'general desirability' of occupations may still be a good predictor of prestige in the traditional form. Theories of social stratification centre around both subjective and objective aspects, and the concept of prestige falls into the former aspect, and thus can be viewed as a way of ordering and classifying the views and evaluations of people about positions in society.

The nature and determinants of stratification are of major interest to theorists and are the cause of much disagreement among them. Most theorists have concentrated on the determinants of stratification. In looking at what major theorists have had to say about the concept of prestige, Marx saw it as being related to power, those having power also having prestige and this possession of power is said to be according to one's relation to the means of production and production processes. Weber argued that there are three different kinds of dimensions of

social stratification, namely, class, status, and parties. Status refers to the existence of an unequal distribution of social honour and social honour is given to people, occupations, styles of life and consumption patterns, by members of society. This distribution of social honour is seen to be closely related to class, but is able to vary independently of it. Status groups Weber saw as being stratified on the basis of consumption of goods. Parsons emphasised stratification as a way of bringing together and ordering society and its social processes. Stratification to Parsons involves the distribution and allocation of social honour by members of a society. The system is ranked in a gradated series of strata, not in a dichotomous manner, as Marxian theory advocates. For Parsons the system is a hierarchy of two parts: the division of labour on the basis of different skills and abilities, and the organisation of the division of labour into different positions with the different positions exhibiting different statuses. Kemper looks at a possible test of the opposing conflict and consensus theories, by considering an ideal ordering of the prestige of positions to see if it differs from an actual ordering of positions.

The two other opposing viewpoints are the unidimensional and multi-dimensional theories (as previously discussed). The latter sees dimensions such as occupation, income, education and ethnic status as being the basis of social stratification of societies, whereas the former sees other dimensions of stratification as becoming subordinated to the occupational hierarchy, through a convergence of stratification systems and this convergence is said to coincide with or be the result of industrialisation. Both theories are based on the notion that the various dimensions along which societies are stratified can be separated conceptually and empirically.

2. The Position of the Concept of Prestige and in Particular Occupational Prestige in Theory.

The concept of prestige in relation to that of occupations appears to have increased in importance as a way of analysing or describing social stratification. Cross (1959) suggested that there is a change from the situation in traditional societies where occupation by itself was hardly a status indicator at all, to the situation in modern societies where occupation confers status in its own right in the same way that other factors such as age, sex, or race might. In line with this view, Tumin (1967) emphasises that in the United States there is more concern with the ranking of occupational statuses than there is with, for example, family background or religious affiliations. In comparing the United States with what might be referred to as nonliterate societies, Tumin regards economic and family roles as occupying different places of importance, the former type of role being given greater priority in the United States.

In a discussion concerned with the dimensions of class inequality, Parkin (1971) says that "the backbone of the class structure, and indeed of the entire reward system of modern Western society, is the occupational order."[6] He acknowledges that other sources of "economic and symbolic advantage do coexist alongside the occupational order", but he goes on to say that, "for the most of the population these tend to be derived from the division of labour."[7]

Parkin stresses that the occupational order is the primary source not only of material benefits, but also of various social and symbolic benefits. He regards status as one example of the important non-material reward which is unequally distributed - "to stand high in the scale of honour is to be awarded certain social advantages and psychic gratification, although this particular kind of inequality has more

general significance. Studies of occupational prestige in a variety of Western societies have recorded a high degree of similarity in the rank ordering of positions. Broadly speaking occupational categories which rank high in the material reward hierarchy also rank high in the status hierarchy, and those which rank low in the former tend to rank low in the latter."[7] There is, according to Parkin, a congruence between the two dimensions of inequality based on the division of labour.

There does seem to be some justification then for looking at the area of occupational prestige as it does have a place of importance in the social stratification of societies and in particular modern Western societies. Blau and Duncan (1967) add weight to this justification, by arguing that the occupational structure in modern industrial society provides a foundation for the main dimensions of social stratification and, more importantly, it provides a "connecting link between different institutions and spheres of social life". By this they mean that the hierarchy of prestige strata and of economic classes have come out of the occupational structure (as has the hierarchy of political power and authority). In addition, Blau and Duncan argue that the occupational structure provides a link between the economy and the family; the economy is able to effect the family's status and at the same time the family is able to supply manpower to the economy.

Parkin, in referring to the occupational structure as the backbone of the reward system, sets out the occupational order in the form of a hierarchy of broad occupational categories, running from high to low:

Professional, managerial and administrative

Semi-professional and lower administrative

Routine white-collar

Skilled manual

Semi-skilled manual

Unskilled manual

Parkin believes that most sociologists generally agree about this approximation to a reward hierarchy. Disagreement does seem to occur, however, when the distribution of social and material rewards are said to vary according to the same hierarchy. Parkin argues that there is a high degree of congruence between class and status and although the multi-dimensional view of stratification acknowledges that this high degree of congruence exists empirically, it is denied that there is any necessary consistency between class and status. It is suggested rather that the occupational order generates serious inconsistencies so that cases of non-alignment in class and status positions can be found. Parkin quotes Runciman's (1968) comparison of a Naval Commander and a Grocer as examples of people sharing the same class position but not the same status position. However, Parkin objects to this example and to others like it, saying that these alleged examples of rank inconsistency do not demonstrate discrepancies between class and status positions, since these differences represent differences in income only. Parkin points out that income is only one of the factors contributing to overall class position. Other contributing factors are, for example, security of employment and social and material advantages (Weber's life-chances). Parkin also questions the relevance of pointing out exceptional instances to sociological generalisations. He concedes that although it might be possible to give a few examples of occupations which are out of rank alignment, it is not at all clear how this would contribute to our understanding of the stratification system.

Parkin goes on to discuss the symbolic aspects of stratification and considers in particular what he refers to as "social honour or status". He notes that since the time of Weber's writing there has

been a rapid decline in the "fortunes and social influence of the landed nobility"[8] in European countries, and this decline in fortunes is said to have increased the tendency for the reward structure to become less diverse. Parkin maintains that "as the occupational order comes increasingly to be the primary source of symbolic as well as material advantages, so the areas for political discrepancy between the different dimensions of inequality tend to diminish."[8] Pinco and Porter (1970) also theorize that as the process of industrialisation advances, the prestige of occupations associated with a high level of industrialisation would increase.

More recently, Featherman, Jones and Hauser (1975) state that some American sociologists are dissatisfied with the over-emphasis on occupational status to the exclusion of other dimensions of inequality, such as financial and power factors. Featherman et al. note that "However, few sociologists would deny the central place of occupational roles within the structure of industrialised societies, or the linkage of the individuals to the society through such roles."[9]

In the uni dimensional view of society, occupational prestige occupies a more important place than in the multi-dimensional view (although the importance of occupation may simply be a reflection of class position) and therefore it is appropriate in looking at the importance of occupational prestige as a way of analysing social stratification in order to assess the applicability of the two views. Parkin points out that the multi-dimensional view might only suit analyses of societies which are highly differentiated along dimensions of inequality, i.e. income, occupation, education, race and sex. But Parkin argues that social collectivities or classes, traditionally the subject matter of stratification, are not being identified using this approach. Parkin says that the multi-dimensional view of the reward system is perhaps useful in analysing societies like the United States of America which are highly differentiated in terms of race or ethnicity, religious

afflictions, social classes and where there are sharp regional variations. But within societies like Britain and many other European countries, multiple cleavages of this kind are said to be less marked and so the multi-dimensional model would seem less applicable. But Párkin goes on to say that even as far as the United States is concerned, the multi-dimensional approach is difficult to reconcile with the notion of stratification as a system of structured inequality. To plot each person's position on a variety of different dimensions tends to produce statistical categories composed of those who have similar "status profiles", but it does not identify the kind of social collectivities or classes which have traditionally been the subject matter of stratification. Such an approach, Parkin believes, tends to obscure the systematic nature of inequality and the fact that it is grounded in the material order in a fairly identifiable fashion.

Burton (1972) looked at the question of how important is prestige as a way of ordering occupations. He asked 54 respondents to sort a pile of 60 cards, each with an occupational title printed on it, "so that occupations which seemed the same were in the same pile."[10] A multi-dimensional scaling analysis was carried out on the data and a three-dimensional solution was found to be the most satisfactory. Three orthogonal semantic dimensions were found. The first was called a dependency dimension, i.e. the degree of freedom, supervision involved and whether occupations are independent, covering items such as the extent to which an employee punched a time clock or took orders from a superior in an hierarchy. The second dimension was interpreted as being a scale of "prestige" and it appeared to be the most strongly related to the amount of education required to hold the job. The third dimension was interpreted as a skill one, reflecting the amount of specific training required for the occupation. For

example, manager and priest are high on the prestige scale but low on the specific skills scale, and conversely, welder, locksmith, are low on the prestige scale but are high on the skill scale. Burton externally validated the prestige scale by requiring 27 of the subjects to carry out paired comparisons of the occupations on "prestige", followed by the same paired comparisons on "income". The remaining 27 subjects did paired comparisons according to "social status" followed by the same paired comparisons on "income". The three scales, prestige, status and income were converted to ordinal scales and the Spearman rank correlations among the scales were, Prestige - status, 0.910; Prestige - income, 0.737; and Status - income, 0.789. Burton concluded that subjects used the criterion of prestige, which also approximates the criterion of status, in performing the sorting task, and that this criterion is substantially the same as the second dimension of the multi-dimensional structure. Prestige then does appear to be an important way of ordering occupations. It accounts for a large proportion of the variance in the similarity of occupations.

Along what lines can we expect the stratification system in New Zealand to be ordered? Davis (1976) in discussing social status in New Zealand, says that at first glance New Zealand would appear to be an apt case for Parkin's uni dimensional thesis, on both aspects of his argument. Here Davis distinguishes between two separate elements in Parkin's argument. First, there is the argument in terms of the social legitimation of inequality; that status and class must necessarily be closely consistent since "if the distribution of honour failed to match the distribution of material advantages, the system of inequalities would be stripped of its normative support." [11] Second, there are long-term changes in the social structures in advanced industrial societies that make discrepancies between status and class

increasingly unlikely, because with the occupational order becoming the primary source of symbolic and material advantages, areas of discrepancy between the different dimensions of inequality tend to diminish. With regard to values and the social legitimation of inequality, Davis expects that in New Zealand, because it is a new society free of the European feudal tradition, there will be displayed a more thoroughly materialistic culture which lacks the more traditional, non-materialistic elements of the value systems of older societies. Therefore we would expect the hierarchy of material advantages to be more reflected in the status order. In addition, and again because of the lack of the more traditional elements of social structure, we would expect the occupational order to provide a more unitary stamp, thus bringing New Zealand very close to Parkin's pure type of industrial convergence (unidimensional theory). New Zealand then appears to be an example of the case for close consistency between class and status. However Davis suggests that, looked at more closely, the assumption of convergence is the weak point in Parkin's argument. Given this assumption it is expected that there will be a growing consistency among the different dimensions of inequality and a convergence in social hierarchy for countries at a similar level of industrial advance. Yet the little evidence available for New Zealand suggests instead that cultural variety is just as important, if not more important than common industrial experience in determining patterns of social hierarchy. Davis looks at Hodge et al.'s (1966) review of 24 national occupational prestige ranking studies and finds that the highest correlation of any national hierarchy with the United States is achieved by New Zealand (0.92 for manual and 0.94 for non-manual occupations) and the United States is hardly a country of comparable industrial attainment. The United Kingdom, however, which on the assumption of industrial

convergence one would expect to be closer in occupational hierarchy to the United States, showed a lower correlation for non-manual occupations (0.82) and only 0.54 for manual occupations. Davis concludes that to the extent that Parkin's thesis rests on the assumptions of industrial convergence, the evidence considered leads us to question any convenient assumptions about the consistency of class and status in New Zealand.

The differences in occupational prestige for countries of similar levels of economic development suggests one of two things; either that there are marked cultural variations in the relationship between class and status hierarchies (thus explaining why countries with similar class structures might have divergent prestige orders), or alternatively, if a standard pattern of class/status relationships across cultures is assumed, it suggests that the divergence in occupational gradings is attributable to variations in class structure. In either of the two cases, Davis maintains that the result is puzzling in terms of industrial convergence theory and brings into doubt any assumptions we would like to make about the overriding impact of class on status in advanced industrial societies. If then the ethnic factor in New Zealand is added to this, there is still a stronger case for considering status as a separable dimension of the status hierarchy, according to Davis and he goes on to say that in fact, New Zealand perhaps should be considered a "mixed" or "composite" society in the context of social stratification research, since clearly there are both occupational and non-occupational institutional sources of inequality in the allocation of status (Parkin, 1972).[12]

Davis argues that there are sound theoretical reasons for supposing that the status dimension will, in the case of New Zealand, be especially salient and institutionally diverse. First, considering only the

occupational sphere, there are grounds for thinking that in a society like New Zealand where there are no great extremes of economic inequality, status distinctions are likely to be especially salient since these remain the only barriers to indiscriminant and institutionally uncontrolled social mixing. Davis quotes the Willmott and Young argument that where there is a greater equivalent in incomes, houses and life styles between middle and working class families, this stimulates the middle class to increase their efforts in preserving the status barrier against the working class.[13]

Wherever one might like to place New Zealand in a uni-dimensional - multi-dimensional continuum, there can be no denial of the importance of occupation in determining prestige and one could expect prestige to be based less on factors such as family background than might be the case in the United Kingdom with its feudal traditions.

With regard to the position of the concept of occupational prestige in theory then, the concept of the prestige of occupations has increased in importance as a way of describing the social stratification of modern Western societies. The occupational order is seen as the primary source of material, social, and symbolic benefits. The occupational structure also provides a link between different institutions and spheres of social life. There is general agreement about a hierarchy of broad occupational categories, from professional at the top of the hierarchy to the unskilled manual category at the bottom of the hierarchy. Social rewards are said by some not necessarily to vary according to the same hierarchy. In the unidimensional view of society, occupational prestige occupies a more important place than in the multi-dimensional view of society. With respect to the importance of prestige as a way of grouping occupations according to their similarity, Burton found

that the respondents used the criterion of prestige in sorting occupations according to their similarity. New Zealand, it seems, should be considered to be a "mixed" or a "composite" society in the context of social stratification research, since there are both occupational and non-occupational institutional sources of inequality, in the allocation of status.

III STUDIES OF OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE

1. Major Empirical Studies of Occupational Prestige.

It can be seen in the following studies that they do not come close to the traditional notions of prestige as they do not look at the deference behaviour of people but rather at people's evaluations of prestige.

Much of the empirical research concerning occupational prestige has involved the use of simple ranking studies. Usually a small number of occupations have been ranked by a sample of respondents in order of the prestige of the occupations from high to low on some defined scale. For example, if a respondent is given twenty occupational titles to rank, he or she is asked to provide a rank ordering of these titles, each rank being occupied by one title only. Some studies have allowed occupational titles to be tied, i.e. more than one occupation may occupy any rank, and others still have indicated to respondents that two or more occupations may be placed in the same rank.

An example of a simple ranking study and also the first of its kind, is that of Counts(1925) where respondents (school children) were asked to arrange a list of 45 occupations in terms of the occupation "most looked up to". Examples of two other studies employing the simple ranking method were those of Hartman (1936) and Coutu (1936). Hartman examined the relative prestige of medical specialities and Coutu looked at the relative prestige of twenty professions, both studies introducing the notion of relative prestige in relation to occupations which are usually seen as similar. Coutu, however, used a paired comparison method in the evaluation task, with the respondents making their judgements on all pairings of

occupational titles. All studies found occupational hierarchies. On the basis of his study, with an inter-respondent agreement of about 0.9, Counts suggested that differences in social background did not affect the occupational rankings. However, the level of agreement was greater for the placing of some occupations, i.e. those which were ranked the lowest. Reasons given for this were that either the respondents, being school children, were uncertain of the prestige of certain occupations or that they were not familiar with the contents of certain of the occupations.

Cattell (1942) also looked at this question of inter-respondent agreement between groups of college graduates and skilled and unskilled workers. Using a sample of college graduates and a list of 26 occupations, Cattell investigated the extent to which informants agreed in the ranking of occupations by prestige. He then compared this small sample with a group of skilled and unskilled labourers. Details of the agreement between these groups in terms of the prestige rankings they gave the occupations were unfortunately not reported, apart from it being said that the agreement was "extremely good". Within the groups, the mean inter-individual correlation was reported to be lower in the case of the labourers than in the case of the students. Of the 26 occupations there were only five on which the groups disagreed.

Researchers have used other techniques in the study of social prestige. Despite the varied techniques which have been used in the study of occupational prestige and despite the fact that studies have taken place at different points in time over many years, there seems to be a high level of agreement in the results obtained.

Bogardus (1928) and associated researchers investigated a related area, that of "social distance". This approach was one where subjects were asked to state how willing they would be to

associate with certain people, represented by some thirty occupations. The degree of association or intimacy ranged from "would marry" and "would admit to my club" through "would admit to my street as neighbours" to "would exclude from my country". However the ranking which resulted closely approximated that of Counts' study.

Another approach to the study of occupations and their prestige was provided by Asch and his co-workers (1938) in a study on the rigidity of what they referred to as occupational stereotypes. A group of subjects was given the task of ranking ten "faculty" professions in terms of the "general esteem" of these professions. The professions were then ranked by the intelligence, social usefulness, conscientiousness, stability of character and idealism thought to be characteristic of the members of the professions. There was a high level of agreement in all rankings, but intercorrelations with "general esteem" were found to be the highest. This finding seems to suggest that the characteristics correlate highly with prestige or that prestige is made up of these different characteristics. It also demonstrates the importance of prestige as a way of ordering or perhaps stereotyping occupations.

Osgood and Stagner (1941) used a refined version of the method used in the Asch et al. study, in an attempt to locate some of the factors associated with occupational prestige. University students were asked to rate 15 occupations according to the factors used in Asch's study along with six additional characteristics. Again the general prestige rankings showed a very high agreement, giving a rank correlation coefficient of 0.96 with Hall's original rankings. Ratings in terms of, for example, "financial return", "job security", "excitingness", were almost the same as the judgements of the general prestige of occupations. One factor, however, "hours of work" showed little or no relation to the general prestige of occupations.

The studies discussed so far involved the use of small samples. Also the list or number of occupations was not large. Smith (1943) attempted to develop a prestige scale of occupations on a much larger scale than had been the case previously. He asked both a sample of secondary school students and a sample of undergraduates to rate 100 occupations from one to a 100 "on the basis of (the) suitable order or rank at a dinner honouring a celebrity with an average member of each occupational class being seated nearer to or further from the celebrity than the average member of another, the distinctions between occupations to be made entirely on the basis of occupational prestige". Davies (1952) when reviewing empirical studies of occupational prestige refers to Smith's study as being a highly imaginative one. However he doubts its usefulness beyond being applied only to the population from which the sample of respondents were drawn. The point of importance and interest in Smith's study was the idea of building a complete occupational scale of prestige. Such an attempt at exhaustiveness was important to the idea that any social scale of occupations will be useful in as much as it is a representation of the real situation, or at least people's perceptions of the real situation. It was also commendable that Smith had hoped to produce a scale of equally spaced and highly representative occupations which could be used repeatedly.

A departure from the simple ranking method and other methods used in the studies discussed so far was that employed in the first study to use a national sample of the population, the study conducted in 1947 by the National Opinion Research Centre (N.O.R.C.), a polling organisation in the United States of America. Ninety most common occupations were placed by respondents into one of six prestige categories, ranging from low to high prestige. The categories used were: "excellent", "good", "average", "somewhat average",

"somewhat below average", and "poor". In the results a point of major interest was that the white-collar (e.g. clerical and sales) occupations were seen to have been accorded a prestige equal to that accorded skilled manual (e.g. craftsmen and foremen) occupations.

Using a similar method to that of the N.O.R.C. investigation, the first English study reported, that of Hall and Jones (1950) asked respondents to place thirty occupations into one of seven ranked categories, according to their "social standing". In line with the results of Counts, Hall and Jones found there to be a high agreement among respondents as to the rating of occupations and there was a high level of agreement also when the data were broken down with regard to age, sex and the occupation of respondents.

More recently Siegel (1971) and Featherman et al. (1975) have found a near invariance in the ratings and rankings of occupational "prestige" over several decades. Hodge, Siegel and Rossi have made a comparison of occupational prestige ratings at selected times and have found little variation in the ratings. Also Blau and Duncan (1967) note that ratings of the "general standing" or prestige of selected occupations have shown to be remarkably "close to invariant with respect to the composition and size of the sample of raters; the interpretation given by respondents to the notion of 'general standing', and the passage of time". Blau and Duncan add that, the use of prestige scales so far is limited by the fact that ratings have been available for relatively small numbers of occupations.

On the basis of a series of studies beginning in 1971, Hope and Goldthorpe (1974) reported a high degree of consensus as to the prestige of occupations, and over periods of two to three months the evaluations were found to vary little, i.e. were highly stable.

If income can be regarded as relating closely to occupational prestige, then the findings of Routh (1965) are significant. He reports a high stability in the relative earnings across a wide range of British occupations between 1906 and 1960. According to Krause (1971) for the majority of societies in the West, income parallels the prestige of occupations and therefore the fact that income is fairly stable may be indicative of a stable prestige system.

In the light of the findings of the various authors discussed, and those of Congalton (1969) who, in Australia, found there to be no significant differences in the ordering of occupations by a sample of university students and a national sample, it seems fair to conclude that there is high stability in the popular evaluations of the ordering of occupations according to their prestige. Svalastoga (1965) in his extensive international comparisons of the prestige ladders of societies, remarks that the similarity across nations must be due to the nature of the occupational role and its place in the division of labour, as individual ratings could not display this kind of regularity.

2. What Underlying Factors are Prestige Scales Measuring?

If it is accepted that there is an ordering of occupations in terms of their social standing and that such an ordering occupies a central position within certain societies, it is appropriate to examine what prestige scales of occupations might be measuring.

Reiss (1961), Siegel (1971) and Goldthorpe and Hope (1974) have concluded that the dimensions seen to underly occupational inequality in the minds of those rating or ranking occupations are many and varied[x]. Only some of these dimensions appear to

---

[x] It might be useful to note here that the term rating throughout has been used in the sense that occupational titles within ranked categories are themselves not ranked, i.e. ordered from high to low according to prestige; occupations are rated so that they are placed into ranked categories.

directly correspond or relate to the commonly held classical or traditional sociological notions of prestige, involving notions of deference, acceptance, and derogation. One could question whether this is the fault of the concept of prestige or whether it is a matter of faulty methods used in the studies. It appears to result in part from the fact that two aspects are involved when people are asked to make judgements about prestige; first, the aspect of what people believe are the sources of status inequalities i.e. what they base their evaluations on; and second, the aspect of the effects which differences in status have on the behaviour and social interraction of people of different statuses. It is the latter aspect which relates to the classical notions of prestige. It seems therefore that the classical notion of prestige is inadquate in describing what prestige is in the case where people make evaluations about the prestige of occupations. This takes us back to a point discussed by Goldthorpe and Hope and also by Parkin. They see the classical concept of prestige as being not entirely applicable, because the social organisation of modern Western capitalist societies may preclude normatively prescribed prestige groups (symbolically legitimated groups with patterned relationships of deference, acceptance and derogation) except at the most microscopic levels. Also the national prestige structure, as viewed by Parkin, is independent of small-scale interraction processes.

Goldthorpe and Hope (1974) summarize the frames of reference employed by informants in a ranking or rating of occupations task in the following way. People in a grading task situation are said not to employ a strictly "prestige" frame of reference involving notions of social superiority and inferiority. Most respondents make decisions about the "social standing" of occupations on the basis of what they know, or think they know, about various aspects

of different occupations, the most common aspect being job rewards or job requirements. Most respondents appear to order occupations along some unspecific "better-worse" dimension.[14] Finally, different respondents operate with different attributes in mind and they attach different weights to them. On the basis of the above four points, Goldthorpe and Hope conclude, "Thus the scales which result from occupational 'prestige' grading exercises may best be taken as representing a synthetic and 'emergent' judgement from the population concerned; a judgement which is indicative of what might be called the 'general goodness', or what we would now prefer to phrase it, the 'general desirability' of occupations."[15]

In a survey by Goldthorpe and Hope (1974) respondents[16] were asked to grade 40 male occupations according to different dimensions; Standard of Living (S); Power and Influence over other people (I); Level of Qualifications (Q); and, Value to Society (V). This study was essentially a pilot study and the sample was referred to as the "four dimensional sample". The four particular attributes were chosen because they covered the range of characteristics most often mentioned by respondents in prestige studies when they were asked on what basis they had ordered the occupations (Taft, 1953; Tiryakian, 1958; Reiss, 1961). The researchers concluded that "The four attributes or dimensions are not treated as synonymous, and the distinctions made among them are to some extent shared by respondents."[17]

Parkin discusses the bases of occupational prestige scales, saying that they are constructed by aggregating the status evaluations of a representative sample of the population and that the resulting ranking of positions is held to indicate the common view of prestige and could be called the "moral referendum" view of social honour.

However, Parkin argues, it is not always clear from the empirical studies whether what is being measured is the individual's own personal evaluation of the social worth or prestige of various positions, or whether it is just his perception of what he takes to be the factual social standing of these positions. Because of our awareness of a status hierarchy, any judgements we make must be affected by our knowledge of how the hierarchy works in everyday life. The fact that most ranking studies report a high level of general agreement should not necessarily be taken as an index of the popular feeling with regard to status. What is often measured is the perception of the existent status heirarchy, and not private evaluations of the way in which positions ought to be socially ranked, if indeed people think they ought to be ranked at all. If occupational prestige studies are mainly tapping the awareness of an existing hierarchy, then such findings cannot be used to support a "moral referendum" view of occupational status distribution. It cannot be said that status derives from popular evaluations of the moral worth of different positions and findings do not give us information about the sources of social honour but about "the popular perception of its factual distribution".[18] So that there is general agreement about the factual status order can be more realistically viewed as a result of effectiveness of the socialisation process in informing people of the social order that society wishes, rather than as evidence of some kind of moral consensus independently arrived at by different class members.

Turning from the underlying dimensions of prestige to explaining the distribution of inequality, Parkin maintains that in order to explain the distribution itself, a different approach is needed. Parkin finds Marx to be a useful guide since in Marxist terms it is plausible to regard social honour as an emergent property

generated by the class system. It can be considered as a system of social evaluation arising from the moral judgements of those who occupy the dominant positions in the class structure. Parkin goes on to say that to suggest that the system of status is dependent on the normative socialisation of one class by another is not to claim that the formal ranking of occupations is ever itself the subject of social indoctrination. This could not be so, it is argued, given the many thousands of occupations involved. It is then the criteria by which positions are to be ranked which are upheld by the socialisation process. Certain criteria become institutionalised as being relevant for ranking purposes. This means it is not necessary for a society to have a detailed knowledge of different occupations in order to be able to locate them in a prestige hierarchy. In fact all that is needed is a rough notion of whether or not any given occupation has the relevant rank attributes. Kriesberg (1962) in his study has suggested, for example, that there is a tendency for people to accord high rank to any occupation they take to be a professional one, and this is because even though they may know little about the particular occupation, they know that professions in general enjoy high status. Parkin concludes that "institutionalized rank criteria provide a framework of occupational stereotypes or categories into which any occupation can be incorporated."[19]

Another researcher to discuss prestige in relation to occupations is Burton (1972). He looks at the semantic dimensions of occupational titles. Burton describes the results of multi-dimensional scaling and hierarchical clustering analyses of a set of 60 names of occupations in the English language. The data for the analyses were obtained from a sorting task in which subjects were required to induce a partition upon the set of terms. The multi-dimensional scaling solution produces a three-dimensional

representation, which is then used to test the previously formulated hypothesis that the criterion of prestige (status) had been used in the sorting task. The hypothesis was in fact verified. An independently obtained scale of prestige was found to exhibit a strong rank-order correlation with one of the axes of the representation, the prestige axis. This was also the longest axis of the representation, indicating that prestige is the most important criterion of the sorting task.

In looking at occupational prestige in a broader context, Hatt (1961) discusses the prestige of occupations as a way of measuring societal position and compares it with other possible measures or indicators. He writes that the significance of occupation as a measure of societal position has often been pointed out by sociologists. For example, in research occupation has been presented as an empirical finding, i. e. occupation is related with other criteria, where stratification position was determined by criteria other than occupation. In other research the dominant role of occupation is taken as given. None of the above mentioned researchers claim that occupation is a sufficient criterion of relative societal position, but all agree that it is a valid index able to be used for most purposes. Hatt maintains that a fully accurate index should approximate total societal position, reflecting prestige. Such an index should satisfy what Hatt refers to as the demands set up by four postulates of stratification:

"1. Different positions occur in many different social structures, e. g. religious, governmental, economic.

2. The rewards of these positions are of various types, e. g. financial gain, advantageous working conditions, and honorific value or psychic income.

3. Some combination of all rewards attached to any position

constitutes the invidious value of that position and hence its prestige.

4. Total societal position is a summation of prestige, modified by the esteem bestowed by others as a reward for the manner in which the expectations associated with any given status are fulfilled."

Hatt views an accurate index of societal position as a summarizing measure of those prestige and esteem values given an individual by virtue of his status within the social structures in which he is involved or participates. In order to appraise the value of an occupational index of societal position Hatt compares it with other current techniques for locating the position of people in society.

One such technique is that of Chapin and his Living Room scale. This scale is a cluster of items including income, occupation, education, a measure of social participation, and the living room scale - a scale which involves the investigation of what people have in their houses in terms of material goods. These goods are scaled according to how they represent status. A study by Guttman (1943) indicates that this scale as a measure of societal position is superior to using just occupation. This is hardly surprising as the scale includes occupation and adds other variables to this and so is bound to be superior. A composite index should provide a more accurate indication than would any single characteristic, such as occupation. Some relationships between occupational position and other positions may be assumed but they are not identical and thus occupation by itself is a less precise index of position in all structures than is an instrument such as the Living Room Scale.

Taking account of the esteem dimension of social position is more difficult than measuring multiple statuses as is done in the Living Room Scale, for example. Hatt suggests that in order to

assess esteem, knowledge of all socially significant community relationships for every individual in the community is required. As a consequence Hatt regards an effective calculation of the esteem component of stratification to be practicable only in the local community or neighbourhood. Hatt gives the work of Warner and his associates (1960) as an example of an investigation of the total prestige patterns and the use of the esteem dimension. In these studies positional prestige and personal reputation are summed to give an individual's total societal position. This "community-reputational" technique does not, in Hatt's view, meet the needs of sociologists, as although the technique is interesting and concrete, the findings are not able to be generalised to cross-community, regional, or national samples.

Hatt states that the two methods of study of stratification discussed so far reflect a total prestige pattern more accurately than a single index is able to. However, both have disadvantages. The "community-reputational"approach is limited because of the lack of general applicability and the Chapin scale's weakness lies in the fact that a home interview is required. Therefore a relatively simple method of estimating societal position is required. Many secondary data that are not available or readily assessed by the "community-reputational" analysis or home appraisal are already tabulated by occupation and other kinds of data require a simple prestige index because of limitations of time or difficulty of access to respondents. In these situations occupation is a relatively easily available and easily gathered index. Hatt concludes that these characteristics plus the evidence of the validity of occupation as an index, indicate it may be a useful research tool. But for occupation to be a really usable index, Hatt proposes that some sensible mode of classification is required. Hatt outlines the

dimensions generally employed in classifications of occupations as being the duties, the prerequisites, and the rewards.

Occupations can be classified according to occupational duties. The example given of such a classification is that of the United States Census Bureau, which is a number of occupations grouped according to their similarity with respect to some criterion, e.g. physical strength, manual dexterity, or education level. Edwards (1933) believed there to be a value scale within census classifications and his "socioeconomic scale" of occupations is based mainly on a "heads and hands" types of work as making up a positional scale. The scale consists of six major groups, two of which are subdivided to give ten more or less hierarchically arranged categories. Edwards' technique is validated using yearly income and total educational qualifications of the job incumbents. The main disadvantage of this type of classification is the absence of evidence that these hierarchical positions reflect accurately the values the public accord them.

Occupations can be classified in terms of employment prerequisites. Here occupations are categorized according to the degree of training, education and intelligence. However this approach assumes that people's responses toward an occupation will be essentially rational and that prestige varies directly with the complexity of skills required for any occupation. The assumption may be valid to a certain extent but other bases of prestige allocation, such as the importance of the occupation to society, possibility of financial rewards, relative pleasantness of the general working conditions, for example, may be ignored. Therefore classifications of this kind have only a limited use in the study of social stratification.

A third method of classifying occupations is by employing occupational rewards, which can be divided into three main areas.

These areas are classifications by financial reward, classification by "honorific value", and classification by working conditions. With regard to classification by financial reward, not all incomes of occupations are consistent with the prestige accorded them. Also income is regarded as private information and factors such as steadiness of employment complicates the hourly, daily, weekly, or monthly earnings. Although incomes may provide a good estimate of prestige since Parkin argues that the economic dimension is dominant.

Income may be judged, for the above reasons, to be an inadequate index of occupational position. With regard to classification by "honorific value" there does not appear to be a scale which employs this dimension alone. Honorific value is said to refer to the amount of respect and regard conferred upon an occupation. Any such scale according to Hatt, would probably not provide a valid and practicable index, since "psychic income" is difficult to separate from other systems of reward and even if it were separable, the same sort of anomalies as those found in the use of income alone, would appear. Used by itself, the scale discussed is too incomplete to serve adequately as an index of occupational position.

A fourth method of classifying occupations is by working conditions. This kind of reward is inherent in classifications such as those using the groups "professions", "proprietors and managers", "white-collar workers" and "manual workers" since these groups are distinguished mainly by factors such as hours, control over time, cleanliness of work, and type of clothing appropriate to wear on the job. Such a classification, however, suffers from the same weaknesses as the Edward's scale and the census type of classification. These weaknesses are that the categories are too broad, some of the categories will overlap, and there is an absence of evidence that these hierarchical positions reflect the value the public gives to them.

Also there is the difficulty of combining diverse values in types of working conditions such as hours worked, time of starting work, clothing, cleanliness, job security etc. Further anomalies exist in this dimension. For example, the hours of work of a labourer are often shorter than those of a physician, but other factors reverse the social positions of these two jobs. The use of working conditions alone as an index of stratification then does not appear to be feasible.

Since none of the above methods of classifying occupations is satisfactory as a single index of stratification, a classification by the combination of rewards seems to be a reasonable solution. With reference to the postulates on which the concept of stratification is based, Hatt (1961) maintains that all rewards accruing to a status constitutes the element of prestige, and it seems logical that this would similarly be true of occupation. Those studies then that attempt to describe occupational prestige actually attempt a synthesis of the total reward system. These classifications of occupations are based on the assumption that people are able to make a total positional judgement. The theoretical aspect of this assumption is well described by Goldhamer and Shils (1939) who say that all deference behaviour is based on such judgements within the observer's value hierarchy. All prestige studies of occupation rest essentially on this assumption and further utilise the same methodology, although Hatt points out that there are differences in techniques. They assume that prestige is estimable and that it lies in the opinions of others rather than in the occupation itself or in any specific rewards attached to that position. Consequently, the method employed is to secure judgements from others about the prestige position of a selected series of occupations. Hatt concludes that "the theory and method of these prestige studies seem to meet the necessary requirements of an index of societal position more nearly than any other method currently available."[20]

It is the technique used which Hatt criticises, saying that such classifications have been inadequate for general application in stratification research and this is due in varying degrees to the incompleteness and unrepresentativeness of the occupations rated, the inadequacy of those who rated them, or, in some cases, to defects in the rating scales themselves. In line with what Parkin has said, Hatt recognises the problem that in scaling tasks subjects are asked how they perceive the occupational structure, and these perceptions should be subject to the usual distortions of social perception. He suggests that one way to approach the problem is to find out if the subjects would rate or rank the occupations differently when asked what they think the status of the different occupations ought to be.

Gusfield and Schwartz (1963) discuss the question of what prestige scales scale. They point out that several theories of stratification distinguish between a normative and a factual order. Parkin (1971) made a similar distinction. The factual order can be described as a description of the distribution of unequal amounts of power, respect, and income according to social position. The normative order can be described as the system of norms by which such differentiation is made legitimate or rejected. This is the judgement of the justice or injustice of the differentiation. Barber (1957) also makes the distinction in talking about social stratification as the "product of the interraction of social differentiation and social evaluation"[21] and says that social differentiation and social evaluation must have a certain degree of congruence with each other. Gusfield and Schwartz ask whether the factual and normative orders are congruent, and which of these form the matter or rating scales? Rating scales such as the N.O.R.C. can be interpreted along different dimensions, e.g. factual dimensions, according to Gusfield and Schwartz. Unidimensional rating scales have been

said to confound these and have led to conclusions which assume that only one of the following dimensions has been used by the respondents.

"1. The respondent's perception of social differentiation: Here the respondent is telling the investigator that some jobs are perceived as 'better' than others, as he sees it. Lawyers get more than the filling station attendant and the respondent recognises this factual order of things.

2. The respondent's perception of others: This is the posture of the natural sociologist. Here the respondent reports on the system of his society. He tells us that whatever his own views or judgements, this is how jobs are ranked in society. He displaces the professional sociologist ..... this may be the case with prestige as well as other items of reward."

In both the above cases the emphasis is on the perception of the factual order. It is not normative and tells us little about the respondent's evaluation of occupations. The respondent may admit that doctors earn more money or command more prestige than do janitors but he need not evaluate this as acceptable, good or just.

"3. The prestige dimension <u>per se:</u> Here we attempt to find out what relative amounts of honour or respect are bestowed by the respondent on occupations. The normative aspect of prestige attribution suggests that some jobs, though they bring money or power, are degrading: others are dignifying. Here we would try to see if the respondent does indeed follow such a process with respect to specific occupations.

4. The attribution of justice: Here we look at the normative order in its clearest form. This would represent the evaluations the respondent has of the rightness of the factual order and his conception of the justness of the system. It would tell us whether or not res-

pondents think doctors and lawyers should get more than machinists and salesmen."

It is worth noting that Centers[22] found that approximately 45% of the urban working class, and rural middle and rural working classes felt that doctors and lawyers made too much money. These occupations, which ranked very high in "occupational standing", were the highest in being judged as instances of over-enrichment.

Gusfield and Schwartz say that the question asked of respondents on the N.O.R.C. study confuses several dimensions of prestige. The question asked was as follows: "For each job mentioned, please pick out the statement that best gives your own personal opinion of the general standing that such a job has. Excellent standing, etc." The question is ambiguous with respect to which of the four dimensions of prestige or evaluation is or are being used.. The authors however claim that they are studying job evaluation, i.e. what a job is worth in, e.g. monetary terms, rather than prestige and for such purposes the distinctions may well be unimportant. But for questions relating to stratification the distinctions are crucial. Gusfield and Schwartz carried out an investigation using a semantic differential scale to determine if occupations with high N.O.R.C. ranks also received high ranks on (a) an evaluative scale, or (b) on a factual-normative scale, i.e. descriptive scale, or (c) on both scales, or (d) on neither scale. They wanted to know whether the meanings attributed to occupations of varying ranks are evaluative meanings in the "good-bad", honorific sense, or whether they are factual-normative, reality based, descriptive meanings. Their findings indicated that the N.O.R.C. scale reflected not only a set of values applied to occupations but also a set of perceptions about the social status which the occupations receive in the society (factual-normative) as well as a set of values.

Reiss et al. (1961) found that the lower economic strata were more likely to emphasise the factual order and used income and security as the main criteria to allocate jobs their standing. Higher strata were more likely to focus on self-expression and "prestige" in the Weberian sense of a separate dimension. The work of Kreisberg (1962) suggests that respondents often act like natural sociologists and he found that the variable of prestige accorded professionals was the most significant variable in explaining the rating of dentists. Other perceived characteristics of the occupation were not as crucial as knowledge of a hierarchy of occupations in which professionals have a high position. Kreisberg wrote that a person accords an occupation high prestige because he knows as a matter of fact that most persons accord members of that occupation high prestige.

The findings of Reiss et al., Kreisberg and those of Gusfield and Schwartz suggest that in the study of occupational prestige, we are getting only the system of evaluations which respondents may use in the judging of occupations. Either we obtain the descriptions of a factual order, in which the existent fact that A is a "better" occupation than B is recognised, or we may be confronted with a "pluralistic ignorance" in which each respondent assumes that the factual order is a reflection of the normative order which others, not himself, possess. In either case the ratings emerge as descriptive rather than evaluative or, ambiguously, a combination of both. Gusfield and Schwartz agree with Kreisberg's suggestion that people learn prestige ratings apart from any imputation of any qualities or moral judgements of specific occupations, and they conclude that future studies requiring judgements of prestige, should be designed in a manner that permits the investigator to designate the amount of variance explained by each of the component

elements of the judgement. The recent work of Reiss et al. indicates the limitations of using N. O. R. C. and other occupational rating scales in use, as evidence of the prestige or of the value accorded occupations. Reiss found that considerations of "prestige" were seldom called into play in choosing an occupation, although respondents did report lack of prestige as one significant variable in deciding that they might leave an occupation. On this basis they concluded that it is not clear that a "prestige" component is consciously perceived as a reward attached to occupations. This conclusion might be contested however, since it is not clear whether subjects would include prestige as a reason for choosing an occupation, as such a reason may be a socially undesirable one.

Simpson and Simpson (1960), look at the correlates and estimation of occupational prestige. They say that the intrinsic correlates of prestige cited most often by recent writers fall under two general headings. One involves responsibility, authority, or control over others' behaviour; the other, knowledge, specialized training, or skill required to perform the work adequately. In addition, they say that many high-ranking occupations possess to a high degree personal autonomy, i. e. a high degree of power to decide one's own patterns of work and to work towards general objectives rather than toward assigned and specific tasks. Simpson and Simpson say that sociologists would probably agree that the above factors have some relation to prestige but there has been no clear indication of their relative importance and it has not been shown whether identical factors can account for gradations in prestige within all occupations. Schemes for classifying occupations have been said to generally make use of some of the intrinsic correlates of prestige, but the relative weighting of criteria has usually been implicit and vague. Simpson and Simpson suggest that if we

knew to what extent various factors can account for differences in prestige among occupations, we could construct from them an index of the prestige of occupations. To this end ratings of three sets of variables were obtained: responsibility; training; education and skill; and personal autonomy. Ratings of these variables were obtained for the ninety occupations used in the N. O. R. C. study. The data were treated by correlational and regression analyses to determine how well the three variables could explain and indicate occupational prestige as measured in the N. O. R. C. study. The main finding was that training, education-skill and responsibility, in conjunction account for much (the authors gave no exact figure here) of the variance in the prestige of occupations and this supports the view of North and Hatt (1953), Kahl (1955), Barber (1957), and others who explain prestige essentially in these terms. Simpson and Simpson say that it is also consistent with Davis and Moore's theory of stratification and maintain that the high ranking occupations will be those which "require the greatest training or talent" and at the same time "have the greatest functional importance for society". Simpson and Simpson suggest that ratings of training-education-skill and responsibility could be used to form an index of occupational prestige. They say that regression weights could be applied but that additional research would be required in order to determine the best weightings of the two variables. Such a scale is thought to be particularly useful in that raters could evaluate new or little-known occupations, given a knowledge of their duties and requirements and arrive at predictions of the prestige of the occupations.

Haug and Widdison (1975) investigated the dimensions of occupational prestige in relation to the consensus theory-conflict

theory debate. The differential salience of eight dimensions of occupational prestige are analysed in a set of ten medical occupations, ranging from the highly ranked brain surgeon to the relatively denegrated chiropractor. Responses from 410 students in a range of college settings are used in the analysis. Two of the eight dimensions were found to have particular theoretical relevance. If the dimension of "importance to society" is found to be a prime predictor of the societal reward of high prestige it would lend support to the structural-functionalist theory. If the dimension of "prestige accorded by others" emerges as a principle indicator then this would fit the alternative model in which victory or defeat in an inter-occupational conflict for position and prestige produces public stereotypical evaluations which are reflected in assessments of differential status. The findings were mixed. When the ten medical occupations are analysed as a set, the two dimensions whose mean scores correlate most highly with general prestige are the difficulty of the academic training required and the intelligence needed for the work. Taken as a set in stepwise multiple-regression procedure, the two variables best predicting prestige and explaining nearly 98% of the variance in this outcome variable are difficulty of training and scarcity of available personnel. The theoretical variables of importance to society and prestige accorded by others have little effect on the ratings. Haug and Widdison give a post-hoc explanation of this finding in terms of the nature of the evaluating group. Although student's ratings of the ten occupations are generally congruent with that of the public, their evaluation of the various dimensions may be related to their current location in the social structure. When each occupation is analysed separately, however, a different result emerges. Now it is the prestige accorded by others which

enters as the first predictor variable in the stepwise multiple-regression procedure, and this holds for each occupation except chiropractor. Strong support is thus given for the cultural stereotypical model. The issue of importance to society is among the first three predictors only for two basic practitioners, the dentist and the physician in general practice, and for the low-rated chiropractor. The finding offers only limited evidence that this structural-functional dimension is a factor in the societal reward of high prestige, suggesting that it is relevant for only certain occupations. The other dimensions which enter in second and third place when prestige-other is included in the analysis, and generally in first and second place when it is omitted from the regression input, are difficulty of training and intelligence required. The impression from the data is that the allocation of prestige awards to occupations by the public is a complex phenomenon involving various levels of explanation. Structural-functional theory provides a partial rationale for only one. There seems to be involved, some notion of the importance of the occupation to society, the normative pressure of the respondent's judgement as to what others think about the occupation, and the respondent's own occupational situation in relation to the occupation under consideration. The researchers conclude that importance to society appears a prestige consideration in a secondary way, and this mainly with respect to occupations whose members have considerable contact with the public, such as the dentist and the general practitioner. Haug and Widdison say that clearly other evaluating groups with different links to the occupational world - the retired, the unemployed, for example, - are needed to sort out more specifically the relative levels of explanation, i. e. personal work situation, cultural norms, and societal importance.

In a study in New Zealand, Vellekoop (1966) applied the research method suggested by Gusfield and Schwartz (1963). Respondents ranked 15 occupations and judged them as word concepts on a set of semantic differential scales, The sample was one of Christchurch university students and there was found to be a high correlation between prestige scores given to the occupations and the connotative meanings attributed to them. The semantic differential scales used were as follows:

middle class - working class; unsuccessful - successful; rich - poor; national - labour; Maori - Pakeha; sober - drunk; honest - dishonest; dirty - clean; rural - urban; and useful - useless.

The results showed that assessment of general rank in New Zealand appears to be based upon a variety of factors, such as formal education, skill and training, amount of authority, independence and autonomy, differentiating between manual and non-manual work and differentiating between dirty and clean work, and the size of the business. Also assessment of general rank appears to be related to ascribed variables such as race, place of residence and religion. However, the importance of these variables cannot be assessed in the present research, since the evaluation of occupational titles with no differentiation other than sex is investigated.

3. Are There Sex Role Variations in Occupational Prestige Ratings?

Haug (1975) has investigated whether or not there is a sex role variation in the ratings of occupations. Haug writes that studies of prestige accorded to different occupations by the general public,

such as the N.O.R.C. 1947 and 1963 ratings of occupations, have a major shortcoming. They have focused on male-dominated occupations, and presented them to respondents in such a context as to suggest that male incumbents were to be given the prestige ratings. In Haug's study, participants were asked to give their opinion of the general standing of a number of occupations, replicating the wording used in the earlier N.O.R.C. study, but omitting the language which put the inquiry into a male context. Data were collected from 600 respondents on ten occupations in the human service field; three were female-dominated, three mixed, and four male-dominated. Findings indicated that females rate female-dominated occupations higher than the males rate these occupations, but both sexes rate the male-dominated occupations almost identically. This general finding was found to be modified by the nature of the social experience of special groups. Thus blacks and the poor, as well as some women in the higher status jobs, exhibit departure from the general trend. This suggests, according to Haug, that women have been socialised to accept general norms with respect to traditional male occupations, but have resisted masculine evaluations of work which has traditionally been in their domain. Such an explanation implies the existence of a female sub-culture in which norms and values peculiar to the female sex, including those referring to work at its status, are crystallized and exchanged.

Haug concludes that overall the findings justify the claim that the sex role variable is an important parameter in the analysis of occupational prestige, a factor which is frequently employed in sociological research in general. She goes on to say that in the United States researchers who have used the occupational variable have not generally separated male and female ratings in their

analysis. Researchers need to take sex-role variation into account if their findings are to be valid for the whole of society and not merely for its male minority.

4. Prestige Scales in New Zealand.

In tracing the development of prestige scales in New Zealand, the work of Congalton (1953), who asked samples of the populations of two small towns in the North Island to rank 30 occupations in terms of their social standing, can be seen as a starting point. Again in 1954 Congalton, this time along with Havighurst, stated that "there exists in New Zealand a need for a classification of occupations according to the status ascribed by the community."[23] On the basis of Congalton's first study and with reference to similar studies (the Hall and Jones, 1950 study of the social grading of occupations in England and Warner's study, 1960, of social class in the United States[24]), a classification of occupations was devised, using a seven point scale. Those occupations reported as having more than 1,000 members (male) were employed. Respondents rated 116 occupations using a seven point scale and the results showed that an attempt to devise a prestige scale on the basis of 30 occupations alone, is not reliable in the psychometric sense. The resulting classification was said to more closely "approximate the true ranking of occupational groups in New Zealand"[25] than did the study where there were only 30 occupations.

Other studies have included factors other than just occupation in relation to prestige, and as such are attempts more at the development of indices of socioeconomic status and it is useful to see how such indices compare with occupational prestige scales. One such important example is provided by the Elley and Irving (1972) scale. Based on male occupational categories, this scale utilises data from the 1966 New Zealand census to produce an

index of socioeconomic status, based on the average level of education (in terms of primary school, secondary school and tertiary education) and the median income for a given occupational classification. A six point scale was derived by combining the standard scores from a level of education and income, giving equal weighting to both. Brooks and Cuttance (1973) tested the Elley-Irving scale with a New Zealand urban sample to explore the feasibility of using the scale in a larger research project. They argued that using only three broad categories of educational level would not reflect present conditions as most of today's society fall within the secondary school category. However it must be noted that since Elley and Irving used the census they are limited to these three categories since these are the only three the census gives and the information required to add other categories is not available elsewhere. Brooks and Cuttance tested the scale on 72 Pakeha and 22 Maori families living in an urban New Zealand community. On the basis of the father's occupation families were placed into one of the six socioeconomic categories of the Elley-Irving scale, and used as the dependent variable in the regression equation with eleven indices of family background as the independent variables. The results indicated that income is the best single predictor of socioeconomic status and that education was the second best. Incomes and socioeconomic status correlated with a coefficient of 0.57, whereas education and socioeconomic status yielded a coefficient of 0.20. Thus it did not appear that the two variables had equal weighting in the equation. But the results showed that indicators other than education and income together need not be considered when measuring socioeconomic status.

Elley and Irving had produced this scale to overcome the shortcomings of other scales which had not provided information of the

proportion of workers to be found in each occupational group. Some knowedge of the relative proportions of workers to be found at each point on the scale is necessary for those researchers who wish to see if their sample conforms to the total population on the socioeconomic dimension. The main purpose of the Elley-Irving scale was to provide researchers with an objective scale which would enable them to test the representativeness of samples drawn for research purposes. The index has been widely used in research in New Zealand and has recently been revised with the aim of providing a more detailed listing of occupations, based on the improved and more comprehensive International Standard Classification of Occupations introduced by the Department of Statistics in 1971. Only male occupations were included in the index because of the difficulty of classifying the category of housewife.

This reduces the sensitivity of the index with regard to women and the increasing percentage (currently about 30%) of females in the work force suggests the importance of an occupational index for women. Elley and Irving have developed a parallel socioeconomic index for women (as yet unpublished).

The only researcher to provide a classification and prestige ranking of women's occupations in New Zealand was Barbara Croy (1968). Croy felt that such a scale was necessary because differential prestige is likely to be assigned to men and women in the same occupations and because some occupations are associated with and can be filled by one sex only. The scale was based on a sample of 255; 210 university students (male and female) who were taking undergraduate courses in sociology, 30 trainee hairdressers (male and female), 10 female clerks and typists, and 5 young professional women. The classification and prestige ranking was found to correlate highly with Congalton's scale and with Vellekoop's scale based on a study done in the Netherlands (1963).[26]

Davis (1974) adapted Congalton's 1969 seven point scale of the status of occupations in Australia to the New Zealand situation. The list of occupations was extended so that the sensitivity of the instrument might be improved. In addition, distinctions in the employment status of occupations, i.e. whether self-employed or on wages, were made and income categories were also introduced. Incumbents who were self-employed, were placed one step higher on the scale than those of the same occupation who were on wages. An occupation's status could also be altered according to the income of the incumbent. These changes were made on the basis of Congalton's research, which indicated that such distinctions in occupational levels are clearly recognised by respondents.

In comparing some of the scales in New Zealand, the Elley-Irving Socioeconomic index was found to correlate highly with prestige scales, those scales based on the training required for different occupations and those based on a logical classification of the nature of work. The Elley-Irving scale correlates 0.83 with the new Congalton scale, adapted for New Zealand by Davis (1974). Other correlations obtained were 0.90 with the earliest Elley-Irving index and 0.90 with Blishen's (1967) Canadian scale (a similar sort of scale. It can be concluded that these scales are measuring approximately the same dimension.

Ballard (1972) compared two measures of socioeconomic status, the Elley-Irving scale and the Congalton-Havighurst scale (although the latter is an occupational prestige scale rather than an index of socioeconomic status). He found that the Elley-Irving scale has the advantage of providing data that allow comparison of sample and population structures. Using the Congalton-Havighurst scale it is often necessary to rate occupations that are not listed. A similar difficulty arises with the Elley-Irving index although not

to the same extent, and with a larger number of occupations available it is easier to approximate those not included in terms of skills required and job content. The Congalton-Havighurst scale makes finer distinctions within occupational groupings, however. Also some discrepancies occurred in the ratings of some occupations and inconsistencies were found to occur at the top end of the scale, mainly because the Elley-Irving index includes more heterogeneous classifications, such as teacher, company director and farmer. A correlation of 0.87 between the two scales was obtained. Ballard's comparisons were with the earlier Elley-Irving scale. The new and improved scale would probably compare more favourably, although it must be remembered that one scale is of socioeconomic status while the other is of occupational prestige and therefore they need not correlate highly. Ballard also found that the earlier scale of Elley and Irving was a little less useful than the Congalton-Havighurst scale as an indicator of social class. Research suggests that class involves differences in life experiences and style. Therefore according to Ballard it seems likely that subjective rankings which involve a more subtle assessment of a complex set of socio-psychological variables, will be better indicators of class than will objective measures which rely on correlates of occupational prestige.

There appears to be some justification for re-examining the occupational prestige scales for New Zealand in view of the possible shifts in the importance of occupation as an indicator of status (Cross, 1959; Parkin, 1971) and shifts in the occupational hierarchy which might have occurred since the time of Congalton's study. The need is also reinforced by the findings of the N.O.R.C. study in relation to an apparent equalising of the prestige of white-collar (clerical

and sales) occupations and skilled-manual (craftsmen and foremen) occupations. The changes of which Parkin wrote (changes in the economic fortunes of occupations) also suggest that these might be reflected in changes in prestige. Cora Vellekoop wrote "The Congalton-Havighurst scale was constructed more than twenty years ago, and many changes have taken place in the occupational structure and the distribution of rewards, which may effect the rating of specific occupations. It is of the greatest importance that a new occupational prestige scale be constructed in the near future".[27]

A prestige scale based on the titles and using the coding of the New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (N. Z. S. C. O.) (1976) would provide a more standardized instrument, since the N. Z. S. C. O. is based on the International Standard Classification of Occupations, and this would aid in the comparison of prestige scales across countries.

Occupational prestige scales do have considerable utility. They can be used as a check on the representativeness of samples with regard to occupational prestige. Such scales are also useful in comparing occupational statuses of fathers and siblings. In addition comparisons of career status stability among different classifications of workers (blue-collar/white-collar workers) can be made. A measure of the prestige of occupations is useful too in developing status models, i. e. models of what status is and how it alters. Finally a major use of prestige scales is as a means of measuring occupational mobility and by doing this, ascertaining social mobility patterns in general. The aim in the construction and use of a prestige scale is that it should be "systematically coherent with the postulates of stratification but also a practical tool for empirical research"[28] (Hatt, 1961).

IV RESEARCH PROBLEMS AND RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Research Problems.

The design centered around certain research questions and problems. First, what is the relative prestige allocated to occupations in New Zealand, with respect to those occupations which were rated in the Congalton-Havighurst study and also with respect to larger numbers of other occupations which were not included in the Congalton-Havighurst study?

Vellekoop (1963) emphasised the many changes which have taken place in the occupational structure and the distribution of rewards since the Congalton-Havighurst study, and that these changes may affect the rating of specific occupations. What are the reasons for expecting changes in occupational prestige ratings?

Since the 1950's New Zealand has undergone more industrialisation, and with industrialisation, in view of the industrialisation convergence theory, one would expect occupations to have become an increasingly important way of allocating people prestige as opposed to prestige allocation according to family background, place of residence, race, religion, sex, for example. Increased industrialisation has brought changes in the occupational structure, in that new occupations have emerged, particularly technical occupations which do not appear to fit easily into a white-collar occupation category and yet the incumbents of such occupations are more highly trained and skilled than manual occupations demand. Where do these technical occupations fit in with respect to prestige?

In modern society in general, the professional has experienced increased status, many semi-professional occupational groups strive for professional status.

With the greater political and social prominance of women and women's organisations, changes in the status of women's occupations might be expected. The changes which might be expected are as follows:

Increased industrialisation might lead to a decrease in the status of farming occupations. An increase in the status of professional occupations might be expected. Improved status of skilled manual vis à vis routine white-collar occupations might be expected. And, finally, the greater political and social prominence of women and women's issues might lead to improved status for women's occupations.

Two further research questions were derived from the Davis scale and the first was whether an incumbent of a particular occupation who is self-employed is allocated a higher status than one who is on wages? Second, where some incumbents are in a higher income bracket than others of the same occupation, do they enjoy higher status? Davis, in constructing his prestige scale of occupations, also expected that the status of a business owner would increase as the monetary value of the business increases, i.e. those owners whose business has a high monetary value would be allocated higher status than those whose business have a lower monetary value. The theoretical importance of the economic factor in the allocation of prestige arises out of Parkin's argument concerning the dominance of material factors.

An important research question was what is the status of female occupations and, in the case of all occupations as well as female occupations, do male and female respondents rate them differently in terms of status? Haug (1975) found that female respondents did rate female occupations more highly than they did male occupations, but that females rated male occupations similarly to their male counterparts.

Another research question was to what extent do the actual occupational prestige orders differ from an ideal ordering? The former type of prestige order can be derived from asking people what they think the status of occupations usually is and the latter type of prestige order can be found by asking people what they think the status of different occupations ought to be. The question separates the different aspects of what one is asking the respondent to do when asking them to rate occupations (as discussed by Parkin, for example). This question also relates to Kemper's suggestion that a test of the conflict/consensus theory might be provided in this way.

A research question which relates to the other research questions, is what are the bases of judgements about the prestige of occupations i.e. what factors are important in ranking? If economic factors are the most important when people are asked the actual ranking of occupations then this would provide support for Parkin's argument concerning the dominance of material factors.

2. Hypotheses.

H1: For those occupations which have incumbents of both self-employed and not self-employed statuses, those who are self-employed will be rated higher on the seven point scale than those who are not self-employed.

H2: Occupational incumbents in a higher income bracket will be rated higher on the seven point scale than those in a lower income bracket.

H3: Business owners whose business value is higher will be rated more highly on the seven point scale than those whose business is of a lower value.

H4: Male and females will rate occupations differently.

H5: Females will rate female occupations higher on the scale than males will.

H6: Respondents when asked to rate the occupations according to what they think their status ought to be will base their judgements of prestige on different factors than when asked to rate occupations according to what their status actually is in the community (actual status).

H7: The status of lower white-collar occupations will be equal to the status of the upper blue-collar occupations.

H8: Where an occupation has a female incumbent it will be rated lower than when it has a male incumbent.

H9: Professional occupations will demonstrate increased status when professional occupations of the Congalton-Havighurst scale are compared with the professional occupations of the Montague-Brown prestige scale (actual scale).

H10: The status of farming occupations as researched by the Montague-Brown (actual) scale will be lower than the status of farming occupations as recorded by the Congalton-Havighurst scale.

3. Research Design.

The research involved two studies; one investigated the prestige of occupations and the other was referred to as the four-dimensional study and investigated the dimensions underlying prestige in the same way as did Goldthorpe and Hope (1974).

The Occupational Prestige Study:

The prestige study was designed along the lines of the Congalton-Havighurst study. Each subject was to rate 40 occupations as a scale 1 to 7, awarding to the social standing (actual scale) of the occupations. The same subjects also were to be asked to rate the same occupations on a scale 1 to 7 according to what they thought the status of the occupations ought to be (the ideal scale).

A Counterbalanced Design:

The rating task and accompanying questionnaire were presented to two groups of students. The study had two parts to it; Part 1, the subjects rated 40 occupations according to their social standing. Part 2, the subjects rated the same 40 occupations according to what they thought the social standing of the occupations ought to be. In order to control for a possible order effect (order of presentation of part 1 and part 2 effecting the way in which the occupations were rated), the first group of subjects received part 1 first followed by part 2, and the second group of subjects received part 2 to rate first followed by part 1.

Sample:

On the basis of results from other studies (Goldthorpe and Hope, 1969; Congalton, 1969)[x] it was decided that the evaluations of university students would provide the prestige scales. There is evidence that the overall prestige structure of occupations is invariant despite the varied measurement techniques and the different samples of rates which have been used. Occupational prestige scales seem to be relatively stable over time, between countries, and between samples (Hodge et al., 1964; Hodge et al., 1966).

---

[x] reported in Goldthorpe and Hope (1974).

With regard to the stability of ratings over time, Goldthorpe and Hope (1969) using a random sample taken from the electoral register of the city of Oxford and ratings at two different time periods (an interval of three months) found a very high intra-individual agreement. Hodge et al. (1966) conducted an extensive comparative analysis of prestige ratings, correlating the results from 23 countries with those of the United States, and a high level of agreement was found. An example of between samples stability of ratings of the social prestige of occupations was provided by Congalton (1969) in an Australian study, where there was found to be no significant differences between the ratings of the social standing of occupations as made by a sample of university students and the ratings of the social standing of occupations as made in a Sydney man-in-the-street survey.

Choice of Occupations to be Rated:

The 373 occupations to be used in the study were chosen so that all met at least one of the five criteria below and each subject was given a sample of 40 of these occupations to rate.

The criteria according to which occupations were included in the study were as follows:

1. Those occupations included in the New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings 1971, which were listed as principal occupations. The Census did not specifically define their use of the term principal. But by comparing these occupations to the totals of the numbers of people in these occupations, it seems that the principal occupations are those where the larger proportions of those gainfully employed can be found.

2. Those occupations included in the Congalton and Havighurst New Zealand study (1954).

3. Occupations with a 1,000 or more members (which involved approximately 2% of those gainfully employed).

4. For occupations where it was appropriate to do so, the self-employed case and the case where incumbents would be on wages, were distinguished.

5. Again, where applicable, occupations were distinguished on the basis of the sex of the incumbents, i. e. for the same occupation there was the male and the female case. An example of this is the occupational titles - Bank teller, female and Bank teller, male.

Coding of Occupations:

The New Zealand adaptation of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (I. S. C. O.) was used for classifying and coding occupations for the 1971 Census. The New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (N. Z. S. C. O.) has since been published in full (1976) and any resulting changes in the 1971 Census coding have been used in the coding of occupations for this study. The N. Z. S. C. O. gives a brief job description for every occupation included.

The occupations selected for rating were taken from the major occupational groups or categories of the Census in such a way as to be representative of the categories numerically. The Census categories were as follows:

1. Professional technical and related workers.
2. Administrative and managerial workers.
3. Clerical and related workers.
4. Sales workers.
5. Service workers.
6. Agriculture, animal husbandry and forestry workers, fishermen and hunters.

7. Production and related workers, transport, equipment operators and labourers.

Choosing 40 Occupations for Each Respondent.

In total there were 373 occupations and each respondent was to rate 40 of these. For each respondent occupations were randomly chosen, with the constraint that a representative number of occupations from within each of the major occupational groups of the Census were to be included. The number representative of Census category was determined in the following way. Consider the category clerical and related workers which contained 32 of the 373 occupations included. The number within this category to be included in each sample of 40 occupations was derived from the general formula

$$\left(\frac{n_g}{N} \times \frac{100}{1}\right) \times \frac{n_r}{1} \frac{n_r}{1}$$

where n_g is the number of occupations included from a census group,

n_r is the number of occupations each respondent received to rate (a constraint in this case, i.e. 40),

N is the total number of occupations to be rated by the sample (a constraint, i.e. 373).

Thus for the clerical workers census group with 32 occupations

$$\left(\frac{32}{373} \times \frac{100}{1}\right) \times \frac{40}{1} = \underline{3.5}$$

Where necessary (as above) the category number was rounded to the nearest whole number.

For the seven categories the number per group of 40 occupations given to each respondent was:

1. 10
2. 2
3. 3
4. 3
5. 4
6. 4
7. 13

Σ = 40

In many studies there has been an over-representation of occupations from the professional group. This could not be avoided since occupations included in other studies were also included here. However, to remedy the situation somewhat, the number of lower status occupations has been increased.

Questionnaire:

Respondents were given a question sheet, asking them to record their sex, with the aim of analysing the results with respect to possible sex role variations in prestige ratings. Included on this question sheet was a question designed to elicit responses about what basis the respondents used in making judgements about the social standing of occupations. This question was asked with respect to the actual ordering of occupations and also with respect to the ideal ordering of occupations. For an identical copy of the questionnaire refer to the Appendix.

Procedure:

(a) In the prestige of occupation study, each respondent was presented with 40 occupations, each occupational title being typed on a card, the 1/4 of the size of an IBM computer card. A question sheet and an instruction sheet were given to each respondent. Further instructions were written on a board in front of the respondents. These were instructions concerning

how they were to rate the occupations (for copies of these instructions refer to Appendix).

At the end of part 1 of the study for both groups of subjects (refer section on the counterbalanced design), the cards with the occupational titles and responses on were collected up, so that respondents were unable to refer back to them when recording their responses for the second part of the study.

The Four-dimensional Study.

To investigate the question of the bases used by people to order occupations, Goldthorpe and Hope's pilot study (1971) was replicated and respondents were asked to rank 40 occupations according to four different dimensions; standard of living of their typical incumbents, their power and influence over other people, then according to their level of qualification, and finally according to their value to society. The sample of respondents used were 25 stage three (undergraduate) students in Sociology. The respondents ranked the same 40 occupations from one to forty.

The 40 occupations used by Goldthorpe and Hope in their study were employed here and they were as follows:

Actor

Agricultural labourer

Airline pilot

Ambulance man

Auctioneer and valuer

Bricklayer

Building site labourer

Bus driver

Business manager

Butcher (own shop)

Carpenter

Car worker

Civil engineer

Clergyman

Clerk

Coalminer

Crane operator

Doctor (general practitioner)

Farmer

Foreman (engineering factory)

Foundry worker

Ladies hairdresser

Nurse

Plumber

Policeman

Postman

Primary school teacher

Printer

Process worker

Radar mechanic

Railway porter

Senior civil servant

Shoe repairer (own shop)

Shop assistant

Silversmith

Social worker

Solicitor

Textiles worker

Upholsterer

The occupations were presented to the subjects in the order presented above, each title being on a card, the size of a quarter of an IBM data computer card.

The instructions to the subjects were:

INSTRUCTIONS (These were written on a blackboard)

You each have 40 cards, each with an occupational title on it. Please rank the occupations, first, according to the standard of living of the average incumbents, then according to their power and influence over other people, then according to their level of qualifications, and finally according to their value to society. Any one or more occupation may be placed in the same rank position. For each of the four rating tasks, record the order in which you arrange the occupations on the numbered sheets provided.

At the top of the first sheet provided respondents were required to record their sex.

V RESULTS.

1. Analysis of Results

The medians of the responses for each occupational title were calculated for all respondents and for male and female respondents separately.

Correlation coefficients, the Kendall Rank correlation coefficient, r (tau), and the Spearman rank correlation coefficient, r_s were calculated with the use of a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (S. P. S. S.) computer programme for nonparametric correlations. The numerical values of r and r_s are not identical for the same data, since r and r_s have different underlying scales and numerically are not directly comparable to each other. Both coefficients, however, utilize the same amount of information in the data, and thus both have the same power to detect the existence of association in the population - i. e. the sampling distributions of r and r_s are such that with a given set of data both will reject the null hypothesis at the same level of significance. It is useful to report both coefficients so that results can be compared with studies which have calculated only one or other of these coefficients. In terms of the power-efficiency of the coefficients, when used on data to which the Pearson r is properly applicable, both r and r_s have an efficiency of 91%, i. e. r is approximately as sensitive a test of the existence of association between two variables in a bivariate normal population with a sample of 100 cases as is the Pearson r with 91 cases (Hotelling and Pabst, 1936).

Scale Inter-correlations:

The various occupational prestige scales which have been developed in New Zealand were correlated with the present prestige

scale. These scales were: the Congalton-Havighurst scale, the Davis scale, Croy's scale and the Elley-Irving scale of socio-economic status. Only those occupations which the various scales had in common were included in the correlations. The number of matching occupations for each correlation were as follows:

	Number
Davis scale with Congalton-Havighurst scale	91
Montague-Brown (actual) scale with Congalton-Havighurst	95
Congalton scale with Davis scale	42
Montague-Brown (ideal) scale with Davis scale	328
Montague-Brown (actual) scale with Davis scale	328
Montague-Brown (ideal) scale with Montague-Brown (actual) scale	373

The results of these correlations are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1: Correlations Among Prestige Scales in New Zealand (for matched occupations)

	Congalton-Havighurst scale	Davis scale	Croy scale	Elley-Irving socio-economic index	Montague-Brown actual status scale	Montague-Brown ideal scale
Congalton-Havighurst scale		r 0.89 ^{xxx} r_s 0.95 ^{xxx}			r 0.76 ^{xxx} r_s 0.86 ^{xxx}	r 0.61 r_s 0.70
Davis scale			r 0.74 ^{xx} r_s 0.82 ^{xx}	r 0.83	r 0.69 ^{xxx} r_s 0.78 ^{xxx}	r 0.57 ^{xxx} r_s 0.66 ^{xxx}
Croy scale					r 0.63 ^{xx} r_s 0.71 ^{xx}	
Elley-Irving socio-economic index					r 0.67 ^{xxx} r_s 0.77 ^{xxx}	
Montague-Brown actual						r 0.54 ^{xxx} r_s 0.62 ^{xxx}

^{xx} correlations significant at the 0.001 level (p 0.001)

^{xxx} correlations significant at the 0.0001 level (p 0.0001)

From Table 1 it can be seen that the highest correlation was that between the Congalton-Havighurst and Davis scales. The next highest correlation was between the Montague-Brown actual scale and the Congalton-Havighurst scale and this correlation was higher than the one between the Montague-Brown actual scale and the Davis scale. The Elley-Irving index correlates with the Davis one 0.83, i.e. more highly than does the Montague-Brown status scale with the Elley-Irving index which gives a correlation of 0.76. It is interesting to note that the Congalton-Havighurst scale correlates more highly with the Montague-Brown actual scale than does the Elley-Irving index with the Montague-Brown actual scale, although the difference in correlation is slight. This slight difference may be explained by the fact that the Congalton-Havighurst and Montague-Brown actual scales are of occupational prestige whereas the Elley-Irving index is one of socioeconomic status. But it does appear that the occupational prestige scales are measuring similar dimensions to the socioeconomic index. The correlation of the Croy scale with the Montague-Brown actual status scale is fairly high at $r = 0.74$ and $r_s = 0.82$. The Montague-Brown actual scale correlates $r = 0.54$ and $r_s = 0.62$ with the Montague-Brown ideal scale, which is lower than correlations of the Montague-Brown actual scale with any of the other prestige scales. This seems to suggest that the Montague-Brown actual scale is more similar to other status scales than it is to the ideal scale. It appears that the ideal scale is measuring something different from the prestige scales. Conversely, correlations of the ideal scale with other scales range from r 0.57 (r_s 0.66) for the Davis scale to r 0.61 (r_s 0.70) for the Congalton-Havighurst scale. These are some of the lower correlations found suggesting that the actual scales are more similar to each other than either are to the ideal scale.

Sex Differences:

When the results are analysed according to the sex of the respondents, very low correlations between the judgements of males and females are found for both the actual and ideal scales. The results are presented in Table 2. The correlations were all significant at the 0.0001 level.

TABLE 2: Correlations between Males and Females for the Montague-Brown Actual and Montague-Brown Ideal Scales, for all Occupations in the Scales.

	Male Actual	Female Ideal
Female actual	r 0.33 r 0.38	
Male ideal		r 0.21 r_s 0.26

There is obviously some sex role variation with respect to judgements about the prestige of occupations. For the actual prestige scale, no one sex ranked occupations consistently higher or lower than the other sex. Females rated most female occupations lower on the scale than did male raters. The occupations which were rated lower were air hostess; bank officer, female; dairyhand (cowgirl); fashion model; general nurse; housekeeping matron; housemaid; housewife; Karitane nurse; kitchenmaid; laundress; midwife; office clerk, female; Plunket nurse; psychiatric nurse; public primary school teacher, female; school dental nurse; women's hairdresser (self-employed and on wages).

The occupations which female respondents rated more highly than the male respondents did were, nurse aid; manageress; florist and waitress. The nurse aid, however, could be a male or female occupation.

Out of the total of 21 female occupations, only four were rated more highly by female respondents.

With respect to the ratings for the ideal scale, however, neither sex rated occupations consistently higher or lower and of the female occupations none were rated consistently higher or lower than the female respondents.

Prestige Ratings - Actual and Ideal Scales:

The bases of prestige ratings for the actual and ideal scales were as follows:

1. Actual Scale. From the table of percentages (Table 3) it can be seen that most respondents said that the length of training, education, prestige, and income were the bases used to rate the occupations according to social standing.

Some factors were mentioned which were not considered to be bases of judgements with respect to ideal status; economic influence, social acceptability, whether self-employed or not; political influence, security, and working hours.

2. Ideal Scale. The greatest percentage of people mentioning one factor was 30.53% and this factor was value to the community. By comparison only 7.38% mentioned this factor in connection with making judgements about the actual status of occupations. The level of training was also important for rating ideal status as were the factors; necessary to society, education, degree of responsibility, and hard work. Factors which were mentioned as bases for ideal ratings but which were not included as bases for rating of actual status were; enjoyment of work, dedication, degree of contact with the public, productivity, creativity and chance of success.

It is clear that in the ideal rating situation people looked to the interests of society to see how useful and necessary an occupation is and that factors such as income, person's right to respect, degree

of autonomy, degree of professionalism, economic influence, social acceptability, whether self-employed or not, political influence, security and working hours were not important or, in some cases, not mentioned as bases of status as they were in the rating of actual status. The results suggest that in the actual case, ratings are made more according to the rewards which an occupation gives to an individual for his own advancement since the factors mentioned were income, economic influence, social acceptability, whether self-employed or not, political influence, security and working hours. However, with ideal ratings, judgements were made more according to the rewards which an occupation gives to the community, since the factors mentioned predominantly were value to the community, degree of responsibility, hard work, dedication, productivity, necessity to society and responsibility to society. Those factors mentioned which were more on the level of individual and personal rewards were not so much economic and personal advancement type of factors and these were enjoyment of work, creativity, responsibility to society, and chances of success.

TABLE 3. Factors on which Respondents based their Prestige Judgements for Actual and Ideal Scales.

Factors	Percentage mentioning factors	
	Actual status	Ideal status
Length of training	10.74	6.87
Level of training	6.04	10.69
Education	10.07	6.11
Prestige	10.07	3.82
Income	10.74	2.29
Degree of responsibility	6.71	9.92
Value to the community	7.38	30.53
Necessity to society	0.67	3.82
Enjoyment of work	0.00	1.53
Knowledge required	2.69	2.29
Dedication	0.00	0.75
Extent to which requirements and abilities are rare	2.69	0.76
Degree of authority	0.67	2.29
Degree of contact with the public	0.00	0.76
Person's right to respect	6.04	2.29
Productivity	0.00	1.53
Hard work	0.00	7.63
Creativity	0.00	0.76
Intelligence required	2.13	1.53
Degree of autonomy	3.36	0.76
Chances of success	0.00	0.76
Regard in which would hold the incumbent	0.76	0.76
Abilities required	0.00	0.76
Responsibility to society	0.67	0.76
Conditions of work	0.67	
Economic influence	0.67	

Continued over

TABLE 3 (continued)

Factors	Percentage mentioning factors	
	Actual status	Ideal status
Variety of work	0.67	
Degree of professionalism	4.70	
Social acceptability	0.67	
Whether self-employed or not	0.67	
Talent required	1.34	
Political influence	0.67	
Service to the community	2.13	
Security	0.67	
Desirability of the job	2.69	
Manual or nonmanual work	1.34	
Amount of physical effort required	1.34	
Chances of social mobility	0.67	
Working hours	1.34	
	100% (N = 149)	100% (N = 149)

Results of the Four Dimensional Analysis:

Goldthorpe and Hope in their study calculated inter-correlations among the four dimensions (Table 4).

TABLE 4: Correlations of the Four Dimensions on which Ratings of Occupations were based in Goldthorpe and Hope's study.*

	S	I	Q	V
Standard of living				
Power and influence	0.7275			
Qualifications	0.8602	0.8693		
Value to society	0.4687	0.527	0.7510	

They stated that on the average two attributes share 70% of their variance and are distinct to the extent of 30%.

The results of ranking along similar dimensions for the present study are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5: Correlations among the Four Dimensions on which the Ratings of Occupations were based.

	S	I	Q	V
Standard of living				
Power and influence	r 0.8010 r_s 0.9416			
Qualifications	r 0.7107 r_s 0.8675	r 0.7402 r_s 0.8940		
Value to society	r 0.5382 r_s 0.7149	r 0.6307 r_s 0.8129	r 0.5879 r_s 0.7939	

All correlations were significant at the 0.0001 level except for the correlations of value to society with the other dimensions and these were significant at the 0.001 level.

* Table A4 p. 157 Goldthorpe and Hope, 1974.

The results compare very well with those of Goldthorpe and Hope, except that the correlation of standard of living with power and influence over other people is the highest whereas it is the fourth in the Goldthorpe and Hope study. The rank orderings are the same apart from this one instance.

2. Tests of Hypotheses.

With reference to the results presented, they may be summarized by turning to the various hypotheses to see whether or not they have been supported -

H1: For those occupations which have incumbents of both self-employed and not self-employed status, those who are self-employed will be rated higher on the seven point scale than those who are not self-employed, i. e. on wages.

TABLE 6: A Comparison of the Median Ratings for Occupations where Incumbents may be Self-employed or on Wages.

	Self-employed	On wages
Automotive electrician	4	4
Bricklayer	5	6
Builder	3	5
Carpenter and joiner	4	5
Men's hairdresser	5	5.5
Painter	5	6
Painter, paperhanger, decorator	5	6
Panelbeater	5	5
Plasterer	5	6
Plumber	4	5
Printer	4	5
Taxi driver	5	5
Watchmaker	3	4.5
Women's hairdresser	5	5.5

It appears that Hypothesis 1 is supported: the only occupations where the self-employed incumbent was not rated more highly than the incumbent not self-employed were as follows; automative electrician, panel beater and taxi driver.

H2: Occupational incumbents in a higher income bracket will be rated higher on the seven point scale than those in a lower income bracket.

This hypothesis was not supported since the same occupations of a different income bracket were rated equal in all cases.

H3: Business owners whose business value is higher will be rated more highly on the seven point scale than those whose business is of lower value.

The results are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7: Status Allocated to Businesses of Different Monetary Value.

	Status
Owner large business valued over $75,000	2
Owner large business valued $30,000-$75,000	2
Owner business valued $15,000-$30,000	2
Owner business valued $ 3,000-$15,000	3
Owner business valued under $3,000	5

The results indicate that the value of the business is positively related to the status given; the direction of the increase in status is the same as the direction of increase in value of the business.

However, the top three businesses have been allocated equal status; therefore the hypothesis is not supported as such and merits rewording to the effect that there is a positive relationship between status of a business and its monetary value.

H4: Males and females will rate occupations differently.

Hypothesis 4 is supported, since for both the actual and the ideal scales the correlations between males and females for

their ratings were low, r 0.33 for the actual scale and r 0.21 for the ideal scale (Table 2).

H5: Females will rate female occupations higher on the scale than males will.

This hypothesis was not supported (refer Sex Differences in the Results section) since neither sex ranked occupations consistently higher or lower. Females rated female occupations lower on the scale than did male raters in the case of the actual status scale. However, with the ideal scale, no clear pattern of differences between the ratings made by males and females emerged. However, the females did not rate female occupations lower than did males for the ideal scale, which suggests that although females think the status of female occupations is lower than do males, with respect to the ideal situation females think the status of female occupations ought to be increased.

H6: Respondents when asked to rate occupations according to what they think their status ought to be will base their judgements of prestige on different factors than when asked to rate occupations according to what their status actually is in the community.

With reference to Table 3, it can be seen that respondents used different factors as bases to rate statuses of occupations for the actual and ideal status scales. For the actual scale the dominant factors were training, education and income, whereas for the ideal scale the dominant factors were value to the community (with 30% of the respondents using this as the major basis of their ratings) and necessity to society.

Ratings with respect to the actual status of occupations were individual oriented whereas ratings with respect to ideal status were more community oriented.

H7: The status of lower white-collar occupations will be equal to the status of the upper blue-collar occupations.

Occupations may be grouped into lower white-collar occupations. Goldthorpe and Hope list these under clerical and sales and lower service occupations (Table 6. 6, p 134 Goldthorpe and Hope 1974) Occupations may also be grouped into upper blue-collar workers. Goldthorpe and Hope list these under the heading of manual workers, skilled and unskilled. Skilled manual workers constitute the upper blue-collar occupations. However, the semi-skilled manual occupations as listed by Goldthorpe and Hope (Table 6. 6) have also been included in the analysis.

With reference to Table 8, it can be seen that the mean of all lower non-manual occupations is 4. 8, and the mean of all upper blue-collar occupations (skilled manual worker) is 4. 8. Therefore the two means are equal and these results support the hypothesis that the status of lower white-collar occupations is equal to the status of the upper blue-collar occupations. Looking at the semi-skilled manual workers, the ambulance driver receives a median of 3 which is higher than any of the lower white-collar workers, and on the whole the semi-skilled manual workers receive similar status to that of the lower white-collar workers.

TABLE 8: Status of Lower White-collar Workers and Upper Blue-collar workers.

Lower white-collar workers (lower non-manual workers)		Upper blue-collar workers (skilled manual workers)	
Air hostess	4	Baker	5
Bank officer	4	Bricklayer	4.5
Bookkeeping clerk	4	Builder	3
Business services salesman	4.5	Butcher	5
	4.5	Cabinet maker	4
Commercial traveller	4	Carpenter	4
Dispatch, receiving and weighing clerk	6	Coalminer	6
		Cook	7
Finance clerk	4	Decorator	4
Fire brigadesman	4	Electrical fitter	4
Insurance clerk	5	Electrician	4
Insurance salesman	5.5	Engine driver	4
Legal clerk	4	Fitter and welder	5
Motor car salesman	5	Fitter and turner	6
Office clerk, male	6	Foreman	4
Office clerk, female	5	Gunsmith	4
Salesman, bookstore	5	Jewelry engraver	4
Salesman, driver	7	Lino and carpet layer	5
Salesman, furniture store	5	Lorry driver	6
Shop assistant	6	Market gardener	4
Spare-parts salesman	5	Painter	5
Stock clerk	5	Plumber	5
Storekeeper	5	Toolmaker	5
Travel clerk	5		
Wages clerk	5		

Continued over

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Semi-skilled manual workers	
Ambulance men	3
Caretakers	5
Drycleaners	5
Gardeners	5
Postal workers	6
Storekeepers	5
Warehousemen	6
Milkmen	5

H8: Where an occupation has a female incumbent, it will be rated lower on the seven point scale than when it has a male incumbent.

The results for the relevant occupations are:

	Male	Female
Bank officer	4	5
Bookkeeper accounts clerk	4	5
Office clerk	6	5
Primary teacher	3	3

There does not seem to be a consistent trend, although the occupation where the female incumbents are rated more highly may be regarded as a more traditional female occupation than is bank officer, for example. The hypothesis does not seem to be supported.

H9: Professional occupations will demonstrate increased status when professional occupations of the Congalton-Havighurst scale are compared with the professional occupations of the Montague-Brown scale (actual status scale).

	Congalton-Havighurst	Montague-Brow
Barrister	1.74	1
Dentist	2.29	2
Editors, newspapers and periodicals	2.83	2
General practitioner	1.56	1
Head teacher	2.43	2
Librarian	4.29	3
Minister of religion	2.27	2
News reporter	4.65	3
Public primary school teacher, female	4.40	3
Public secondary school teacher	3.40	3
Social worker	4.16	3

Hypothesis 9 appears to be supported since all of the professional occupations of the Congalton-Havighurst scale have higher status on the Montague-Brown prestige scale.

H10: The status of farming occupations as recorded by the Montague-Brown (actual) scale will be lower than the status of farming occupations as recorded by the Congalton-Havighurst scale.

	Congalton-Havighurst	Montague-Brown
Gentleman farmer, fairly well established	2.62	2
Gentleman farmer, well established	2.10	4
Farmer, owner, aided by family	4.12	3
Farmer, tenant, aided by family	4.89	4
Farmer, tenant, owns no capital	5.60	5
Farm manager and supervisor	6.37	6
Sharemilker	4.86	5
Sheep farmer on own behalf	2.98	2

The hypothesis is unsupported as only in one case, that of sharemilker, has the status of a farming occupation decreased since the Congalton-Havighurst study.

Elley and Irving, in relation to their scale of socioeconomic index and with reference to the New Zealand population census, calculated the percentage of the male work force as represented by the different levels of their scale. Such a table of proportions of occupations represented by each level of the scale provides a useful tool for researchers when they wish to check their sample's representativeness of the work force. In Table 9 the Montague-Brown (actual) status scale has been organised into the seven levels and with reference to the 1971 Census the percentage of the male labour force and the female labour force and then the total labour force, which each level of the scale represents have been calculated.

TABLE 9: Proportions of Work Force (Male, female and Total) represented by the Levels of the Montague-Brown Actual Scale.

Level 1 (1.43% male labour force, 1.05% female labour force, 2.86 total labour force).

airline pilot, barrister, biologist, cabinet minister, diplomatic representative, economist, general practitioner, geologist, hospital doctor, judge, lecturer tertiary education, member of parliament, physicist, psychologist, senior government and local body official, surgeon (specialist), veterinarian in private or public practice.

Level 2 (3.07% male labour force, 4.83% female labour force, 5.27% total labour force).

administration accounting personnel manager, advertising manager, aeronautical engineer, agricultural engineer, airport manager, astronomer, auctioneer, auditor, chartered accountant, chemical engineer, civil engineer, civil engineering technician, dentist and dental surgeon, detective, development and research manager, gentleman farmer (fairly well established), industrial relations manager, large farm owner (seldom works farm), management, work study and methods engineer, market research analyst, owner businesses valued $75,000, $30,000 to $75,000 and $15,000 to $30,000, physiotherapist, research officer (social sciences), sheep farmer on own behalf, sociologist, statistician, town and country planner.

Level 3 (13.86% male labour force, 13.60% female labour force, 5.25% total labour force).

air traffic controller, ambulance officer/driver, architectural draughtsman, builder (self-employed), chief clerk administration officer, chiropractor, civil engineering draughtsman, clothing designer, commercial artist, commercial photographer, dairy farmer on own account, dairy farmer in partnership, dental

TABLE 9 (Continued)

mechanic, dietician, factory manager, farmer (owner, aided by family), farm manager and supervisor, flying instructor, forest manager, helicopter pilot, hotel/motel manager, kindergarten teacher, land speculator, land surveyor, librarian, motion picture or T. V. cameraman, musician, news reporter, occupational therapist, office manager, owner business valued $3,000 to $15,000, photographer, plunket nurse, printer (self-employed), private primary school teacher (female), probation officer, producer performing arts, production manager, professional sportsman and woman, psychiatric and/or medical social worker, psychiatric nurse, public primary school teacher, purchasing officer, radiographer, restaurant manager, sales manager, secretary-organiser, service manager, sheep farmer in partnership, social worker, speech therapist, teacher of singing and music, tele-communications technician, traffic engineer, traffic officer, veterinary assistant, watchmaker (self-employed), working proprietor - motel.

Level 4 (16.97% male labour force, 44.54 female labour force, 18.75% total labour force).

air hostess, armed forces personnel, automative electrician, bank officer (male), bookkeeper accounts clerk (male), cabinet maker (self-employed), carpenter and joiner (self-employed), cheese maker grader and tester, commercial traveller, community nurse, dancing teacher, electrical fitter (general), electrician, estate and land agent, farmer (tenant, aided by family), fashion model, finance clerk, fireman (fire brigade), fishing boat captain, foreman (construction, metal and machinery, synthetic products), general nurse, gentleman farmer (well established), grain or other crop grower, gunsmith, hand potter, herd tester, interior decoration designer, jeweller and jewelry repairer, jewelry engraver,

TABLE 9: (Continued)

karitane nurse, livestock buyer, Maori welfare officer, market gardener, meat inspector, midwife, motor vehicle mechanic, national park ranger, orchardist, post office counter clerk, private inquiry agent, receptionist (general), retail and shop manager, school dental nurse, sculptor or painter, shorthand and dictaphone typist, stock and station agent, teachers' college student (primary), (secondary), technical salesman and service advisor, tour and travel guide, urban and rural valuer, wholesale/retail sales supervisor, wholesale and warehouse manager, working proprietor in cafe bars, catering, wholesale, restaurants and hotels.

Level 5 (18.61% male labour force, 26.54% female labour force, 22.79% total labour force).

aircraft steward, boat builder, boiler maker, bread baker, book binder, book embosser, bookkeeper accounts clerk (female), bookkeeping machine operator, brewer, brick layer (self-employed), builder (not self-employed), business services salesman, butcher on wages, carpenter and joiner (not self-employed), carpet weaver, cook, dry cleaner, electrical equipment assembler, farmer (tenant, owns no capital), fitter welder, florist, foreman - food/beverages, gardener, glass blower, horse trainer, housekeeper supervisor, housekeeping matron, housewife, insurance clerk, jockey, laboratory techician, library assistant, linoleum and carpet layer, men's hair-dresser (self-employed), milkman, monumental mason, motor car salesman, musical instrument maker/repairer, office clerk (female), owner business valued under $3,000, painter (self-employed), painter paperhanger decorator (self-employed), panelbeater, patient receptionist, photographic darkroom worker, plant maintenance mechanic, plasterer (self-employed), plumber, printer on wages, punched card machine operator, radio and T.V. repairman, retail butcher with shop, retail and shop manageress, salesman bookstore,

TABLE 9 (Continued)

salesman furniture store, secretary-typist, shearing contractor, slaughterman, spare-parts salesman, stock clerk, storekeeper, taxi driver, telephone switchboard operator, installer and lineman, toolmaker, travel and booking clerk, undertaker and embalmer, wages clerk, waiter, warehouse salesman, watchmaker (not self-employed), well driller borer, women's hairdresser (self-employed), wood carver, working proprietor - retail and shop, zoo attendant.

Level 6 (17.91% male labour force, 13.93% female labour force, 37.77% total work force).

boiler attendant, builder's labourer, building caretaker, bulldozer operator, building maintenance man, car painter, circus performer, coalminer, dairyhand (female), dishwasher, dispatch receiving and weighing clerk, dredge operator, driver of light lorry, electric power lineman,, excavating machine operator, farmhand, fencer, fisherman, fitter and turner, forest hand, forklift truck operator, glazier, handyman labourer, hospital aid, launderer, laundress, market garden worker, masseur, motor vehicle process worker, trolley bus driver, night watchman, office clerk (male), oiler and greaser, orchard worker, painter (not self-employed),pastrycook cakemaker, plasterer on wages, post and telegram deliverer, precast and prestressed concrete products worker, railway conductor, railway engine driver, road grader operator, salesman driver, service station attendant, sewing machinist, sheetmetal worker, shepherd musterer, ship's deck rating, shoe repairer, shoe sewer and machinist, shop assistant, spinner and weaver -wool, station hand (sheep), street vendor, tanker/lorry driver, tanner curer and dryer, tobacco grader and blender, tractor driver, trawlerman, tyre retreader, vehicle upholsterer, waitress, waterside worker, women's hairdresser (not self-employed).

TABLE 9 (Continued)

Level 7 (13.54% male labour force, 21.93% female labour force, 4.86% total labour force).

cafeteria or canteen attendant, canning and bottling process worker, chimney sweep, cleaner building interiors, dairy factory hand, dairyhand (milker), factory labourer, food packer, freezing worker, grave digger, hotel porter, housemaid, kitchenmaid, land girl, loader checker, men's hairdresser (not self-employed), millhand, pest destruction worker, pulp production worker, railway shunter, road maintenance labourer, sugar processor and refiner, timber stacker, vehicle washer.

VI DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

It appears that respondents were able to allocate prestige ratings to the different occupations with respect to both the actual and the ideal prestige situations.

In the research the distinction which Parkin points out, between status as a reputational attribute of persons and status as a formal attribute of position, has been made. The latter use of the term is the one employed in the research, that is the term status describes the system of ranked positions which constitute the national prestige structure, since respondents are asked to rate the social standing of the occupational title and not the reputation of persons. That respondents have been able to rate occupations in a series of strata is consistent with Parson's (1964, 1970) view of stratification as involving the distribution and allocation of social honour by members of a society with the overall structure being ranked in a gradated series of strata rather than being dichotomous, as in the case of Marxist theory.

It was found that occupations where incumbents were self-employed received a higher status than those where incumbents were not self-employed. However, the prestige allocated to the same occupation for different income levels, showed no variation. In the case of the business owners whose business is of higher monetary value, a higher status was allocated than to the businesses of a lower monetary value. Thus the suggestions put forward by Davis and the bases on which the Congalton scale for Australia was adapted for New Zealand are in the main valid.

With regard to the status of female occupations, there appears to be no clear pattern; males in the same occupation did not receive higher or lower ratings consistently. Males and females rated occupations differently, the correlation between the two being low,

and in the case of the actual status scale females rated female occupations lower than did males. This finding is in disagreement with the suggestion of Haug from the findings of her study. Haug's findings indicated that females rated female-dominated occupations higher than males rate these occupations. This finding could have resulted from respondents confusing the factual and ideal occupational scales, rating occupations according to the ideal.

Haug suggests that women have been socialised to accept general norms with respect to traditional male occupations, and this appears to be the case in this thesis. However, Haug's view that women have resisted masculine-evaluations of work which has been traditionally female-dominated does not seem to be the case in the present research since women rated women-dominated occupations lower than the males did. Haug believes that there is an existence of a female sub-culture with norms and values peculiar to the female sex with regard to work and its status; this does appear to be the case. However the norms and values Haug found were not the ones in the results for the Montague-Brown scale. Haug's conclusion that the sex rate variable is an important parameter in the analysis of occupational prestige does appear to be a valid one however. However, the fact that the same pattern did not emerge with respect to the ideal status scale suggests that women think that female occupations should not be rated lower than male occupations. The bases of the prestige judgements for the actual scale and the ideal scale are very different, with a large percentage of respondents rating ideal prestige on the basis of the value of an occupation to the community, with only a small percentage basing their judgements on the same factor in the case of the actual scale. Income was an important basis for ratings for the actual scale but was a minor factor when it came to ratings for the ideal status of occupations.

Goldthorpe and Hope (1974) stated that job rewards and job requirements are the bases of the allocation of prestige. The results of the actual scale in the present study, suggest that this appears to be the case, since income, prestige and degree of responsibility together account for 27.52% of the responses.

In making their evaluations respondents have not used a strictly prestige frame of reference involving notions of social superiority and inferiority, but they have made decisions about the "social standing" of occupations on the basis of what they know about various aspects of different occupations, the most common aspect being job rewards and job requirements (Goldthorpe and Hope, 1972) in the actual prestige scale and in the ideal scale, value to society was the most common aspect upon which evaluations were based.

Kreisberg (1962) thought that the basis of prestige allocation is whether or not an occupation is a profession. For the actual status scale 5% of the respondents used the degree of professionalism of an occupation as a basis for allocating its prestige.

Hatt saw prestige as being based on a combination of all rewards attached to an occupation, and from the table of factors on which judgements were based, this appears to be so. Although many of the factors on which judgements were based (e.g. training, education, knowledge required, the extent to which job requirements are rare, intelligence required) are related to the prerequisites or requirements for an occupation rather than to the rewards attached to a position. Therefore status seems to depend on job characteristics and rewards, on the prerequisites of an occupation and on the occupation's relationship with the community.

With respect to New Zealand, Vellekoop believed prestige to be based on the following; formal education, skill and training, amount of training, amount of authority, independence and autonomy, the

differentiation between non-manual and manual work, between dirty and clean work and other factors such as the size of a business, race, religion and residence of the incumbents. In the present study only the last six factors were not mentioned by respondents as bases for their judgements.

The replication of Goldthorpe and Hope's four-dimensional study showed that the factors, influence and power over other people, value to society, level of qualifications, and standard of living, as ways of ordering occupations are highly correlated. This suggests that the four attributes are not treated as completely synonymous, since correlations are not perfect and also the distinction made among them are shared by respondents.

Following Kemper's suggestion, a test of the conflict-consensus theory debate might be provided by seeing if there is any difference between an actual and an ideal ordering of occupations according to prestige. A low correlation between the actual and ideal orderings was found, which suggests support for conflict theory. Another way of carrying out a possible test between the two theories would be to compare the ideal status ratings with a measure of the actual ordering of occupations according to their income (that is if it can be assumed that the occupations are in fact ordered by income), and education. The Elley-Irving index makes use of both these factors to provide an objective scale. However, it is difficult without further research to determine the weights which should be given separately to income and to education since it appears that they should not be equal (Simpson and Simpson, 1960).

The industrial convergence theory or unidimensional theory is supported in part since occupations associated with industrialisation have increased their status; that is the status of upper blue-collar occupations is now equal to that of lower white-collar occupations. However, at the same time the status of farming

occupations has not decreased as would probably be expected under the industrial convergence theory.

The fact that Elley-Irving's socioeconomic index correlates reasonably well with the Montague-Brown actual status scale also suggests that occupation is not the total source of status allocation and so the unidimensional theory is not supported. However, because there is a correlation of occupational status with other sources it does not completely support the multi-dimensional viewpoint; therefore one might expect that New Zealand is a composite society, a mixture of both unidimensional and multi-dimensional sources of status or perhaps at a transitory stage somewhere between these two extremes.

The present scale should be of use to researchers who wish to investigate the relationship between occupational prestige and other variables, or who wish to match groups with respect to occupational status. This research achieves the following. It provides a scale for female occupations which has in the past not been forthcoming in other countries. If used in conjunction with the table of the proportion of the population in the different occupations, it will enable researchers to check the representativeness of their samples with respect to occupations and occupational prestige.

It has provided a very much needed updated version of the Congalton-Havighurst status scale, and has controlled empirically the distinction made by Parkin and by Gusfield and Schwartz, between personal evaluation of the social worth or ideal status of positions and the factual (or actual) social standing. The results allow inter-reactional comparisons to be made by coding the occupational titles according to the New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations which is itself based on the International Standard of Occupations. The social status scale also takes into account employment status of an occupation, that is whether the incumbent

is self-employed or on wages. The research is probably limited by the fact that the sample is not a national one, and yet with the stability of ratings found by other researchers over wide social groups, this may not be a serious limitation. Future research that would be useful would be research using a national sample and this would make international comparisons possible.

NOTES

1. Discussed in Goldthorpe and Hope (1972).
2. Class is viewed in terms of the relationship to economic power. The distinction between owners and non-owners is made along with the distinction between those with property and those without. These two factors are viewed as the bases of all life chances.
3. Parties are groups which pursue political power in a broad sense "a communal action no matter what its content may be" (pp 262-3, Weber, 1958).
4. p 24. Open University. Unit 9.
5. Conflict Theory and consensus theory.
6. p 30. Parkin, F. (1971).
7. p 30. Parkin, F. (1971).
8. p 39. Parkin, F. (1971).
9. p 330. Featherman et al. (1975).
10. p 59. Burton (1972).
11. p 44. Parkin, F. (1971).
12. p 33. Parkin, F. (1972).
13. p 58. Runciman (1972).
14. p 11. Goldthorpe and Hope (1974).
15. p 12. Goldthorpe and Hope (1974).
16. Sample size = 348.
17. p 155. Goldthorpe and Hope (1974).
18. p 41. Parkin, F. (1971).
19. p 43. Parkin, F. (1971).
20. p 248-249. Hatt (1961).
21. p 2. Barber (1957).
22. p 142. Centers (1949).
23. p 10. Congalton and Havighurst (1954).
24. Warner used a sample of Harvard students.
25. p 14. Havighurst and Congalton (1954).

26. Vellekoop (1963) in Forster, J. (ed.) "Social Process in New Zealand" (1969).
27. p 266-267. Vellekoop (1963).
28. p 82. Hatt, P. (1961).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

Thanks are due to Peter Davis for his careful supervision of the design of the research and his helpful comments throughout. I'd like to thank Bruce Jamieson for his comments on the draft form of the thesis. Professor Willmott's advice in the methodology and his permission to use sociology students as respondents was very much appreciated. In the recording of the results, Andrea Baker and John Langley gave up much of their valuable time and I thank them, along with Bob Gidlow for his advice in obtaining funds for the use of the computer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allardt, E. Theories about social stratification; integration and conflict theories. Is a synthesis possible? In Jackson, J.A. (ed.) Social Stratification, Cambridge University Press, 1968 pp. 14-24.

Allingham, J.D. On the measurement of occupational prestige. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 1, 1, 1965, pp. 53-61.

Anderson, D. and Davidson, P.S. Ballots and the Democratic Class Structure. Palo Alb. Stanford University Press, 1943.

Archer, M.Z. and Giner, S. (eds) Contemporary Europe, Class, Status, and Power. London, Weiderfeld and Nicholson, 1971, Introductory Chapter.

Asch, Black and Hertzman. Studies in the principles of judgements and attitudes - I. Journal of Psychology, 1938.

Baldock, C. Social Stratification in New Zealand. Vocational Choices, Achievement Values and Occupational Stratification. Thesis for Ph.D. in Sociology, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, August 1968.

Ballard, K.D. A comparison of two measures of socio-economic status. N.Z. Journal of Educational Studies, 7, 2, 1972, pp. 168-171.

Bandler and Patterson. Social Status of Women's Occupations. Occupations, 1948.

Barber, B. Social Stratification. A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process. New York, Harcourt Brace & Co., 1957, p. 2.

Beckman, A. A new scale for gauging occupational rank. Personnel Journal, XIII, 4, September 1934, pp. 225-233.

Bell, W. Economic, family and ethnic status. An empirical test. American Sociological Review, 20, 1, Feb. 1955, pp. 45-52.

Bendix, R. and Lipset, S. (eds) Class, Status and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

Blau, P.M. and Duncan, O.D. The American Occupational Structure. John Wiley & Sons Inc., N.Y., U.S.A. 1967.

Blishen, B.R. The construction and use of an occupational class scale. Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 24, 1958, pp. 519-531.

Blishen, B.R. A socio-economic index for occupations in Canada. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4, 1967, pp. 41-53.

Bogardus, E.S. Occupational distance. Sociology and Social Research, XIII, September 1928, pp. 73-81.

Bowden, A.O., Caldwell, F.F. and West, G.A. A study in prestige. American Journal of Sociology, XL, 2, September 1934.

Brooks, I.R. and Cuttance, P.F. Socio-economic status in New Zealand. A critique of the Elley-Irving Scale. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 8, 2, 1973, pp. 154-159.

Brooks, I.R. and Cuttance, P.F. Socio-economic status in New Zealand. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 9, 3, October 1973, pp. 66-67.

Broom, L., Jones, F.L. and Zubrzycki, J. An occupational classification of the Australian work force. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 1, 2, October 1965, Supplement, p. 1-16.

Brown, C.M. The status of jobs and occupations as evaluated by an urban Negro sampling. American Sociological Review, 20, 2, October 1955, pp. 561-566.

Burton, M. Semantic dimensions of occupation names. In Shepard, R.N., Romney, A.K. and Nerlove, S.B. (eds). Multidimensional scaling: Theory and Applications in the Behavioral Sciences, 2, Seminar Press, New York and London, 1972.

Cantril, H. Identification with economic and social class. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943.

Caplow, T. The Sociology of Work. New York: McGraw Hill, 1954.

Carr-Saunders, A.M. Metropolitan conditions and traditional professional relations. In The Metropolis in Modern Life, Fisher, R.M. (ed.), N.Y., Doubleday & Co., 1955, pp. 280-281.

Cattell, R.B. The concept of social status. Journal of Social Psychology, XV, May 1942, pp. 293-308.

Centers, R. The Psychology of Social Classes: A Study of Class Consciousness. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1949, p. 142.

Condcliffe, J.B. The Welfare State in New Zealand. London: Allan and Unwin, 1930.

Congalton, A.A. Social Class Awareness in Adolescents. Publications in Psychology. No. 3, Wellington Victoria University College, 1953.

Congalton, A.A. Social grading of occupations in New Zealand. British Journal of Sociology, IV, March 1953, pp. 45-60.

Congalton, A.A. Methodology of research into occupational prestige: Reply to Allingham. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 1, 2, October 1965, p. 121-129.

Congalton, A.A. Status and Prestige in Australia. Melbourne F.W. Cheshire, 1969.

Congalton, A.A. and Havighurst, R.J. Status Ranking of Occupations in New Zealand. Department of Psychology, Victoria University College, Wellington, 1953.

Congalton, A.A. and Havighurst, R.J. Status ranking of occupations in New Zealand. Australian Journal of Psychology, 6, 1954, pp. 10-16.

Counts, G.S. The social status of occupations. School Review, 1925.

Coutu, W. The relative prestige of twenty professions. Social Forces, XIV, 4, May 1936, pp. 552-529.

Cross, E. The occupational variable as a research category. American Sociological Review, 24, 5, October 1959, pp. 640-649.

Croy, B.J. Correlates of Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Adolescent Girls. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Canterbury University, 1968.

Dahrendorf, R. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford, 1939, pp. 157-170.

Davies, A.F. Prestige of occupations. British Journal of Sociology, III, 2, June 1952, pp. 134-147.

Davies, A.F. Images of Class; An Australian Study. Sydney University Press, 1967.

Davis, K. Human Society. N.Y. Macmillan Co., 1949.

Davis, P. Occupational Prestige Ranking Scale. Unpublished mimeograph, 1973.

Davis, P. An Occupational Prestige Ranking Scale for New Zealand. Dept. of Psychology and Sociology, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, 1974.

Davis, P. Social Status in New Zealand. Some Theoretical and Methodological Issues. Paper presented at the Methodology Session of the Workshop of Social Stratification, Wellington, August, 1976.

Davis, K. and Moore, W.E. Some principles of stratification. American Sociological Review, 10, April 1945, pp. 242-249.

Department of Statistics. New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings, 4, Wellington 1971.

Department of Statistics. New Zealand Standard Classifications of Occupations, Wellington 1976.

Duncan, O.D. A socioeconomic index for all occupations. In Reiss, A.J. (ed.) Occupations and Social Status. Free Press of Glencoe, N.Y. 1961.

Duncan, O.D. and Duncan, B. Residential distribution and occupational stratification. American Journal of Sociology, IX, March 1955, pp. 493-503.

Durkherm, E. The Division of Labour in Society. New York: Free Press, 1947.

Edwards, A.M. A social economic grouping of the gainful workers in the United States. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 28, December 1933, pp. 377-387.

Elley, W.B. and Irving, J.C. A socio-economic index for New Zealand based on levels of education and income from the 1966 census. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 7, 2, 1972, pp. 151-167.

Elley, W.B. and Irving, J.C. A socio-economic index for New Zealand. A rejoinder to I.R. Brooks and P.F. Cuttance. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 10, 2, June 1974, pp. 135-136.

Farber, B. and Osoinach, J.C. An index of socio-economic rank of census tracts in urban areas. American Sociological Review, 24, 5, October 1969, pp. 630-640.

Featherman, D.L., Jones, F.L. and Hauser, R.M. Assumptions of social mobility research in the U.S.: The case of occupational status. Social Science Research, 4, 1975, pp. 329-360.

Gerstl, J.E. Determination of occupational community in high status occupations. Sociological Quarterly, 2, 1, January 1961, pp. 37-48.

Gerstl, J.E. and Cohen, L.K. Dissensus, status and egocentrism in occupational rating. British Journal of Sociology, XV, 1964, pp. 254-261.

Goldhamer, H. and Shils, E.A. Types of power and status. American Journal of Sociology, XLV, 2, September 1939, p. 178.

Goldthorpe, J.H. and Hope, K. The Social Grading of Occupations: A New Approach and Scale. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1974.

Gould, J. and Kolb, W.L. (eds) A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. London, Tavistolle Publications, 1964, pp. 531, 532, 692, 693.

Gray, L.B. Status Inconsistency and Political Attitudes. Canterbury University M.A. Thesis, 1966.

Gross, L. The use of class concepts in sociological research. American Journal of Sociology, LIV, 5, March 1949, pp. 417-418.

Gusfield, J.R. and Schwartz, M. The meaning of occupational prestige: reconsideration of the NORC scale. American Sociological Review, 28, 1963, pp. 265-271.

Guttman, L. A review of Chapin's social status scale. American Sociological Review, VIII, 3, June 1943, pp. 362-369.

Hall, J. and Jones, D.C. Social grading of occupations. British Journal of Sociology, 1950, pp. 31-35.

Hall, R.H. Occupations and the Social Structure. 2nd edition. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1975.

Hare, A.E.C. Industrial Relations in New Zealand. Wellington: Victoria University College, 1946.

Hartman, G.W. The prestige of occupations. Personnel Journal, 1934, p. 5.

Hartman, G.W. The occupational prestige of representative professions. Psychological Bulletin, 1934.

Hatt, P.K. Occupation and social stratification. In Reiss, A.J., Duncan, O.D., Hatt, P.K. and North, C.C. New York. The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961, pp. 239-258.

Hatt, P.K. Occupation and social stratification. American Journal of Sociology, 55, 6, May 1950, pp. 533-543.

Hatt, P.K. Occupation and social stratification. In Tumin, M.M. Social Stratification. Readings in Modern Sociological Series. Prentice-Hall Inc., N.Y. 1970.

Havighurst, R.J. Studies of Children and Society in New Zealand. Christchurch: Canterbury University College, 1954.

Heller, C.S. (ed.) Structured Social Inequality: A Reader in Comparative Social Stratification. New York. The Macmillan Co., 1969.

Hochbaum, G., Darley, J.G., Monachesi, E.D. and Bird, C. Socioeconomic variables in a large city. The American Journal of Sociology, LXI, 1, July 1955, pp. 31-38.

Hodge, R.W. A comparative study of occupational prestige. In Bendix, R. and Lipset, S.M. (eds). Class, Status and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

Hodge, R.W., Siegel, P.M. and Rossi, P.H. Occupational prestige in the United States. American Journal of Sociology, 70, November 1964, pp. 286-302.

Hodge, R.W., Siegel, P.M. and Rossi, P.H. Occupational prestige in the United States, 1925-1963. In Bendix and Lipset (eds) Class, Status and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 1966, pp. 322-334.

Hodge, R.W., Treiman, D.J. and Rossi, P. A comparative study of occupational prestige. In Bendix and Lipset (eds) Class, Status and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective, 2nd Ed., New York, The Free Press, 1966, pp. 309-321.

Hope, K. Occupational grading and occupational prestige. In Hope, K. (ed.) The Analysis of Social Mobility: Methods and Approaches. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Hotelling, H. and Pabst, M.R. Rank correlation and tests of significance involving an assumption of normality. Annual Mathematical Statistics, 1936, 7, pp. 29-43.

Hutchison, B. The social grading of occupations in Brazil. British Journal of Sociology, 8, 2, June 1957, pp. 176-189.

Hyman, H. The psychology of status. Archives of Psychology, 1942.

Inkeles, A. and Rossi, P.H. National comparisons of occupational prestige. American Journal of Sociology, LXI, January 1956, pp. 329-339.

Inkeles, A. Industrial man: the relation of status to experience, perception, and value. The American Journal of Sociology, LXVI, 1, July 1960, pp. 1-31.

Irving, J. and Elley, W.B. The development of a socio-economic index for New Zealand based on levels of education and income - derived from the Census. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 7, 2, November 1972.

Jones, F.E. and Jones, F.L. Occupational prestige in Australia and Canada: a comparison and validation of some occupational scales. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 8, 1972, pp. 75-82.

Kahl, J.A. (ed.) Comparative Perspectives on Stratification. Little Brown & Co., Boston, 1968.

Kahl, J.A. and Davis, J.A. A comparison of indexes of socio-economic status. American Sociological Review, 20, June 1955, pp. 317-325.

Kemper, T.D. Marxist and Functionalist theories in the study of stratification: common elements that lead to a test. Social Forces, 54, 3, March 1976, pp. 559-578.

Kephart, W.M. Occupational level and marital disruption. American Sociological Review, 20, 4, August 1955, pp. 456-465.

Knights, D. A classificatory scheme for occupations. The British Journal of Sociology, XXVI, 3, September 1975, pp. 294-308.

Krause, E.A. The Sociology of Occupations. Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1971.

Kreisberg, L. The bases of occupational prestige: the case of dentists. American Sociological Review, 27, April 1962, pp. 238-244.

Kun, M.J. Industrialism and Occupations: A Study in the Relative Centraling of Evaluative Beliefs. M.A. Thesis, University of Canterbury, 1975.

Lasswell, T.E. Class and Stratum; An Introduction to Concepts and Research. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Laumann, E.D. Prestige and Association in an Urban Community: An Analysis of an Urban Stratification System. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Laumann, E.D., Siegel, P.M. and Hodge, R.W. (eds) The Logic of Social Hierarchies. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970.

Lehman, H.C. and Witty, P.A. Further study of the social status of occupations. Journal of Educational Sociology, V, 1931, pp. 101-124.

Lenski, G. Power and Privilege. A Theory of Social Stratification. New York, 1966.

Lingoes, J.C. Guttman-Lingoes Nonmetric Program Series. Mathesis Press, Michigan, 1973.

Lipson, L. The Politics of Equality. Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Lodge, I. and Blau, R. Broad occupational groupings by intelligence levels. Occupations, XX, 6, March 1942, pp. 419-423.

Lyman, E.L. Occupational differences in the value attached to work. American Journal of Sociology, LXI, 2, 1955, pp. 138-144.

Maranell, G. M. (ed.) Scaling: A Source Book for Behavioral Scientists. Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago, 1974.

Marx, Karl. Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1975.

Mason, W.S. and Cross, N. Intra-occupational prestige differentiation: the school superintendency. American Sociological Review, 20, 3, June 1955, pp. 326-331.

Mitchell, J. C. The differences in an English and an American rating of the prestige of occupations: A reconsideration of Montague and Pustilnie's study. The British Journal of Sociology, 15, 2, June 1964, pp. 166-173.

Mokken, R. J. A Theory and Procedure of Scale Analysis: With Applications in Political Research. Mouton & Co., Netherlands, 1971.

Montague, J. B. and Pustilnik, B. Prestige ranking of occupations in an American city with reference to Haug and Jones' study. British Journal of Sociology, 5, 2, June 1954, pp. 154-160.

Morris, R. T. and Murphy, R. J. The status dimension in occupational structure. American Sociological Review, 24, April 1959, pp. 231-239.

N. Z. Official Yearbook. Wellington: Government Printer, 1966.

Nisbet, R.A. The Social Bond: An introduction to the study of society. New York, Alfred Knopf Inc., 1970.

North, C. C. and Hatt, P. K. Jobs and occupations, a popular evaluation. Opinion News, 9, 1947, pp. 3-18.

Osgood, C. E. and Stagner, R. Analysis of a frame of reference by a gradient technique. Journal of Applied Psychology, XXV, June 1941, pp. 275-290.

Ossowski, S. Class Structure in the Social Consciousness. London. 1963, pp. 19-68.

Parkin, F. Class Inequality and Political Order: Social Stratification in Capitalist and Communist Societies. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1971.

Parsons, T. A revised analytical approach to the theory of social stratification. In Parsons, T. Essays in Sociological Theory. Glencoe: Free Press, 1964.

Parsons, T. Equality and inequality in modern society, or social stratification revisited. Sociological Inquiry, 40, 1970, pp. 13-72.

Pfautz, H. Current literature on social stratification. critique and bibliography. American Journal of Sociology, 58, January 1953, pp. 391-418.

Pineo, P.C. and Porter, J. Occupational prestige in Canada. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4, February 1967, pp. 24-40.

Pineo, P. and Porter, J. Occupational prestige in Canada. In Lauman et al. (eds) The Logic of Social Hierarchies, Ch. 12, 1970, pp. 174-188.

Porterfield, A.L. and Gibbs, J.P. Occupational prestige and social mobility of suicides in New Zealand. American Journal of Sociology, LXVI September 1960, pp. 147-152.

Ramsay, C.E. and Smith, R.J. Japanese and American perceptions of occupations. American Journal of Sociology, 65, 5, March 1960, pp. 475-482.

Redmond, M. and Davies, F.R.J. The Standardization of Two Intelligence Tests. Wellington, N. Z. Council for Educational Research, 1940.

Reiss, A.J. Jr. Occupational mobility of professional workers. American Sociological Review, 20, 6, December 1955, pp. 693-700.

Reiss, A.J. Jr., Duncan, O.D., Hatt, P.K. and North, C.C. Occupations and Social Status. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Rettig, S., Jacobson, F. W. and Pasmawilk, B. Status overestimation, objective status, and job satisfaction among professions. American Sociological Review, 33, 1, February 1958, pp. 75-83,

Roe, A. The Psychology of Occupations. New York: Wiley, 1956, p. 144.

Rosenberg, M. Occupations and Values, Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1957.

Routh, G. Occupations and Pay in Great Britain, 1906-1960. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1965.

Runciman, W.G. Class status and power. In J.A. Jackson (ed.) Social Stratification, London, 1968, pp. 25-61.

Runciman, W.G. Towards a theory of social stratification. In F. Parkin (ed.) The Social Analysis of Class Structure, London, Tavistock Publications Ltd, 1974, pp. 55-101.

Sarapata, A. Occupational Prestige Hierarchy Studies in Poland. World Congress VIII, 21 August, Working Group 1. Influence of the scientific and technological revolution on the development of social structure of socialist society.

Sarapata, A. and Wesolowski, W. The evaluation of occupations by Warsaw inhabitants. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 6, May 1961, pp. 581-591.

Schuessler, K. Analyzing Social Data. A Statistical Orientation. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, U.S.A. 1971.

Shepard, R.N., Romney, A.K. and Nerlove, S.B. (eds). Multi-dimensional Scaling: Theory and Applications in the Behavioral Sciences, 1, Theory.

Shils, E. Deference. In Jackson, J.A. (ed.) Social Stratification, Sociological Studies 1, Cambridge University Press, 1968, pp. 104-132.

Siegel, P. The American occupational prestige structure. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971. Referred to in Featherman, Jones and Hauser Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the U. S.: The Case of Occupational Status, 1975.

Simpson, R. L. and Simpson, I. H. Correlates and estimation of occupational prestige. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 1960, pp. 135-140(a).

Smith, M. An empirical scale of prestige status of occupations. American Sociological Review, 8, April 1943, pp. 185-192.

Stevenson, T. H. C. The vital statistics of wealth and poverty. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, XCI, 1928, pp. 207-230.

Super, D. E. The Psychology of Careers. New York, Harper, 1957.

Sutch, W. B. Training for New Zealand's Future. Submission to the Commission of Inquiry into Vocational Training, Wellington, June, 1965.

Sutch, W. B. The Quest for Security in New Zealand, 1840-1966. Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Svalastoga, K. Prestige, Class and Mobility. Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1959, pp. 74-78.

Svalastoga, K. Social Differentiation. New York: David McKay, 1965.

Taft, R. The social grading of occupations in Australia. British Journal of Sociology, 4, 2, June 1953, pp. 181-187.

The Open University. Stratification and Social Class. (Social Sciences: A Second Level Course. The Sociological Perspective Unit 9) The Open University Press, 1972, pp. 10-27.

Thomas, M. R. Reinspecting a structural position of occupational prestige. American Journal of Sociology, 67, 5, March 1962, pp. 561-565.

Tilly, C. Occupational rank and grade of residence in a metropolis. The American Journal of Sociology, LXVII, 3, November 1961. pp. 323-330.

Tiryakian, E.A. The prestige evaluation of occupations in an under-developed country: The Philippines. American Journal of Sociology, 63, 1958, pp. 390-399.

Tominaga, K. Occupational mobility in Tokyo. Japanese society and the labour mobility. The Journal of Economic Behavior, 11, 1, 1962.

Tumin, M.M. Readings on Social Stratification. Readings in Modern Sociological Series. Alex Inkeles (ed.) Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970.

University of California. Burroughs B6700 SPSS. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Unseem, J., Tangent, P. and Unseem, R. Stratification in a praire town. American Sociological Review, VII, 3, June 1942, pp. 333-334.

Van Den Berghe, P. Dialectic and functionalism: toward a theoretical synthesis. American Sociological Review, 28, 5, 1963 pp. 695-705.

Vellekoop, C. Naar een bereops prestige stratification van urouwen berdepew. (A prestige rating of women's occupations.) Sociologische Gids, X, Nov-Dec 1963, pp. 294-305.

Vellekoop, C. The meanings of occupational prestige and the semantic differential. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 2, 1, April 1966, pp. 45-49.

Vellekoop, C. Social strata in New Zealand. In Forster, J. (ed.) Social Process in New Zealand, New Zealand. Longman Paul, 1969, pp. 233-271.

Warner, W.L., Meeker, M. and Eeells, K. Social Class in America: A Manual of Procedure for the Measurement of Social Status. New York: Harper & Bros, 1960.

Weber, M. Class, status and party. In Max Weber, C.H. Garth and C.W. Mills (eds). Oxford Press, New York, 1958.

Wesdlowski, W. and Slomczinski, K. Social stratification in Polish cities. In Jackson, J.A. (ed.) Social Stratification, Cambridge University Press, 1968, pp. 175-211.

Wilkinson, F. Social distance between occupations. Sociology and Social Research, XIII, 1929, pp. 234-244.

Young, M. and Willmot, P. Social grading by manual workers. British Journal of Sociology, 1, 4, December 1956, pp. 337-345.

APPENDIX A.

The median status for occupations as evaluated by respondents are presented in Table 10. Status levels can be rounded to the nearest whole number where applicable.

TABLE 10: Results for the Actual and Ideal Occupational Prestige Evaluations.

N.Z.S.C.O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
2193	Administration accounting personnel manager	2	2
2199	Advertising manager	2	3
0244	Aeronautical engineer	2	2
0292	Agricultural engineer	2	2
5994	Aircraft steward	4.5	4.5
5994	Air hostess	4	4
0411	Airline pilot	1	2
3595	Air traffic controller	3	2
3594	Airport manager	2	2
5995	Ambulance officer/driver	3	2.5
0324	Architectural draughtsman	3	2
9950	Armed forces personnel	4	5
0135	Astronomer	2	2
4431	Auctioneer	2	2
1104	Auditor	2	2.5
8552	Automotive electrician, self-employed	4	3
9552	Automotive electrician, not self-employed	4	4
9915	Baker's labourer	7	5
3393	Bank officer, male	4	4
3393	Bank officer, female	5	6
5323	Barman	5	5
1201	Barrister	1	1

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
0511	Biologist	1	1
9543	Boatbuilder	5	4
9693	Boiler attendant/fireman	6	6
8736	Boiler maker	5	3
9261	Bookbinder	5	4
9262	Bookembosser (hand tools)	5	4
3311	Bookkeeper, accounts clerk, male	4	4
3311	Bookkeeper, accounts clerk, female	5	4
3411	Bookkeeping machine operator	5	5
7781	Brewer - distilled or malt liquors	4.5	5
9511	Bricklayer, self-employed	4.5	4
9511	Bricklayer - on wages	6	5
9591	Builder, self-employed	3	3
9591	Builder, not self-employed	5	4
9903	Builder's labourer	6	6
5510	Building caretaker	6	5
9592	Building maintenance man	6	4
9743	Bulldozer operator	6	6
6314	Bushman	6	6
4420	Business services salesman	4.5	5
7733	Butcher, on wages	5	5
8110	Cabinet maker, self-employed	4	3
8110	Cabinet maker, not self-employed	6	5
2011	Cabinet minister	1	2
5324	Cafeteria or canteen attendant	7	6.5
7741	Canning and bottling process worker	7	6
9391	Car painter	6	6
9541	Carpenter and joiner, self-employed	4	4
9541	Carpenter and joiner, not self-employed	5	4
7545	Carpet weaver	5	5.5

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
8450	Car process worker and assmbler	6	6
1102	Chartered accountant	2	2
9856	Chauffeur, including government	5	5
7753	Cheese maker, grader and tester	4	4
0250	Chemical engineer	2	2
3001	Chief clerk administration officer	3	3
5523	Chimney sweep	7	7
0794	Chiropodist	2.5	3
0791	Chiropractor	2.5	2
8621	Cinema projectionist	5	4
1750	Circus performers	6	6
0221	Civil engineer	2	1.5
0323	Civil engineering draughtsman	3	2.5
0331	Civil engineering technician	2	3
5521	Cleaner building interiors	7	7
1623	Clothing designer	3	3
7113	Coalminer	6	6
1621	Commercial artist	3	3
6496	Commercial deer shooter	5	5.5
1631	Commercial photographer	3	4
4321	Commercial traveller	4	4
0721	Community nurse	4	3
0841	Computer programmer	2	2
5321	Cook	5	5
6221	Crop hand	6.5	6
7750	Dairy factory hand or worker	7	6
6152	Dairy farmer on own account	3	2.5
6153	Dairy farmer in partnership	3	2.5
6251	Dairyhand, milker	7	6
6251	Dairyhand, milker, cowgirl	6	4.5

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
1723	Dancing teacher	4	5
8425	Dental mechanic	3	3
0631	Dentist and dental surgeon	2	2
5821	Detective	2	2.5
2192	Development and research manager	2	2
0691	Dietician	2.5	2
2022	Diplomatic representative	1	1
9916	Dishwasher, kitchenhand	6	6
3911	Dispatch, receiving and weighing clerk	6	5
9744	Dredge operator	6	5.5
9853	Driver of light lorry/van	6	6
5602	Dry cleaner	5	5
0901	Economist	1	1
1592	Editor, newspapers and periodicals	2	2.5
0231	Electrical engineer	2	2
8531	Electrical equipment assembler	5	5
8511	Electrical fitter (general)	4	4
8551	Electrician, self-employed	4	4
8551	Electrician, not self-employed	4	4
8571	Electric power lineman	6	5
4412	Estate and land agent	4	4
9741	Excavating machine operator	6	4
9918	Factory labourer	7	6
2121	Factory manager, income under $8,000	3	3
2121	Factory manager, income over $8,000	3	3
6115	Farmer, owner, aided by family	3	3
6116	Farmer, tenant, aided by family	4	3
6117	Farmer, tenant, owns no capital	5	5
6211	Farmhand, farm labourer	6	6
6000	Farm manager and supervisor	3	3

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
4512	Fashion model	4	5
6212	Fencer	6	6
3394	Finance clerk	4	4
5811	Fireman, firebrigadesman	4	3
6411	Fisherman	6	4.5
6414	Fishing boat captain	4	4
8412	Fitter and turner	6	5
8413	Fitter welder	5	4
4514	Florist	4.5	4
0413	Flying instructor	3	3
9716	Food packer	7	6.5
9001	Foreman - construction	4	4
7006	Foreman - food/beverages	5	5
7004	Foreman - metal and machinery	4	4
7003	Foreman - synthetic products	4	4
6324	Forest hand	6	5
5321	Forest manager	3	2
9791	Forklift truck operator	6	6
7730	Freezing worker	7	7
6273	Gardener, groundsman, greenkeeper	5	4
2111	General manager	2	2
0712	General nurse	4	2.5
0611	General practitioner	1	1
6113	Gentleman farmer, fairly well established	2	2
6112	Gentleman farmer, well established	4	3
0331	Geologist	1.5	2
8911	Glass blower	5	3
9570	Glazier	6	5
3101	Government and local body executive official	2	2
6122	Grain or other crop grower	4	3.5

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
9910	Grave digger	7	7
8391	Gunsmith	4	4
8921	Hand potter	4	3
9913	Handyman labourer	6	6
1391	Head teacher, principal	2	1
0414	Helicopter pilot	3	3
0662	Herd tester	4	4
6248	Horse trainer	5	6
5992	Hospital aid, nurse aid	5.5	4
0612	Hospital doctor	1	1
5993	Hospital orderly	6	5
5001	Hotel, motel manager	3	3.5
5405	Hotel porter	7	6
5202	Housekeeper supervisor	5	4.5
5203	Housekeeping matron	5	6
5401	Housemaid	7	6
0006	Housewife	4.5	4
2193	Industrial relations manager	2	2
6215	Inspector of weeds and pests	4.5	4
3935	Insurance clerk	5	4.5
4411	Insurance salesman	3.5	3
1625	Interior decoration designer	4	3.5
8801	Jeweller and jewelry repairer	4	3.5
8805	Jewelry engraver	4	3.5
1801	Jockey	5	5.5
1591	Journalist and reporter	3	3
1221	Judge	1	1
0722	Karitane nurse	4	4
1341	Kindergarten teacher	3	3
5402	Kitchenmaid	7	7

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
7511	Knitting machinist	6	6
0141	Laboratory technician	5	3.5
6214	Land girl	6.5	4.5
0007	Land speculator	3	4
0311	Land surveyor	3	2
6114	Large farm owner, seldom works farm	2	3
5601	Launderer	6	7
5601	Laundress	6	6
1312	Lecturer tertiary education	1	1
3934	Legal clerk	4	5
1911	Librarian	3	3
3951	Library assistant	4,5	4.5
7970	Linoleum and carpet layer	5	4.5
4222	Livestock buyer	4	4
9714	Loader, checker	7	6
6311	Logging manager	3.5	3
9853	Lorry and van driver	6	6
0281	Management, work study and methods engineer	2	2
1931	Maori welfare officer	4	2.5
6112	Market gardener	4	3
6271	Market gardener worker	6	6
0902	Market research analyst	2	2
0763	Masseur	6	6
0663	Meat inspector	4	4
0350	Medical engineering technician	3	3
0541	Medical science technician	2.5	2
2011	Member of parliament	1	1
5702	Men's hairdresser, self-employed	5	5
5702	Men's hairdresser, not self-employed	5.5	5

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
0715	Midwife (registered)	4	3
4525	Milkman	5	5
7323	Millhand	7	6
0270	Mining engineer	2	2
1411	Minister of religion	2	2
8201	Monumental mason	5	4
1633	Motion picture or T. V. cameraman	3	3.5
4519	Motor car salesman	5	5
8431	Motor vehicle mechanic, self-employed	4	4
8431	Motor vehicle mechanic, not self-employed	4	4
8450	Motor vehicle process worker	6	6
9852	Motor trolley and bus driver	6	6
9411	Musical instrument maker/repairer	5	3.5
1713	Musician	3	4
5912	National park ranger	4	2.5
1591	News reporter	3	2
5893	Nightwatchman	6	6
0762	Occupational therapist	3	3
3931	Office clerk, male	6	4
3931	Office clerk, female	5	5
3002	Office manager	3	3
8466	Oiler and greaser	6	6
0730	Optician	2	2
6131	Orchardist	4	5
6231	Orchard, vine worker	6	6
1712	Orchestral conductor	2	2
0791	Osteopath and chiropractor	2.5	2
0001	Owner large business valued over $75,000	2	2
0002	Owner large business valued $30,000-$75,000	2	2
0003	Owner business valued $15,000-$30,000	2	2
0004	Owner business valued $3,000-$15,000	3	3.5

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
0005	Owner business valued under $3,000	5	4
9311	Painter, self-employed	5	5
9311	Painter, not self-employed	6	6
9312	Painter, paperhanger, decorator, self-employed	5	3
9312	Painter, paperhanger, decorator, not self-employed	5	5
8737	Panelbeater, self-employed	5	4.5
8737	Panelbeater, not self-employed	5	5
7763	Pastrycook, cakemaker	6	5
3943	Patient receptionist	5	5
6497	Pest destruction worker	7	6
0670	Pharmacist	2.5	2
1639	Photographer	3	3
9270	Photographic darkroom worker	5	5
0120	Physicist	1	1
0761	Physiotherapist	2	2
8461	Plant maintenance mechanic	5	4
9551	Plasterer, self-employed	5	5
9551	Plasterer, not self-employed	6	5.5
8711	Plumber, self-employed	5	4
8711	Plumber, not self-employed	5	5
0714	Plunket nurse	3	3
5822	Policeman	3	3
3315	Post Office counter clerk	4	4.5
3702	Post and telegram deliverer	6	6
9431	Precast and prestressed concrete products worker	6	6
9211	Printer, self-employed	3	3
9211	Printer, not self-employed	5	5
5891	Private inquiry agent	4	3
1331	Private primary school teacher, female	3	3

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
3217	Private secretary to executive	4	3.5
1932	Probation officer	3	2
1740	Producer, performing arts	3	3
2129	Production manager	3	3
1802	Professional sportsman and woman	3	3.5
1933	Psychiatric and/or medical social worker	3	2
0713	Psychiatric nurse	3	3
1921	Psychologist	1	1
1332	Public primary school teacher, female	3	2
1332	Public primary school teacher, male	3	2
1322	Public secondary school teacher	3	2
7330	Pulp and production worker	7	7
3422	Punched card machine operator	5	5
4223	Purchasing officer, general	3	4
9492	Quality inspector, manufactured goods	4	3.5
0540	Radio and T. V. repairman	5	4
0771	Radiographer	3	3
3601	Railway conductor	6	6
9831	Railway engine driver	6	5
9843	Railway shunter	7	5
9909	Railway trackman ganger	7	6
3941	Receptionist, general	4	5
9917	Refuse collector	7	7
0903	Research officer (social sciences)	2	2
5002	Restaurant manager	3	4
4002	Retail and shop manager	4	4
4002	Retail and shop manageress	5	4.5
7731	Retail butcher with shop	5	4
9746	Road grader operator	6	6
9912	Road maintenance labourer	7	6

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
2191	Sales manager, income over $8,000	3	3.5
2191	Sales manager, income under $8,000	2	3
4519	Salesman bookstore	5	6
4522	Salesman driver	6	6
4519	Salesman furniture store	5	5
0641	School dental nurse	4	3
1610	Sculptor and/or painter	3.5	3
2195	Secretary-organiser	3	4
3212	Secretary-typist	5	4
2021	Senior government and local body official	1	1
2194	Service manager, income over $8,000	3	3
2194	Service manager, income under $8,000	3	3
4515	Service station attendant	6	5
7951	Sewing machinist	6	6
6119	Sharemilker	5	4
6244	Shearing contractor	5	4
6146	Sheep farmer in partnership	3	3
6141	Sheep farmer on own behalf	2	2
8732	Sheetmetal worker	6	5.5
6241	Shepherd musterer	6	5.5
9810	Ship's deck rating, crewman	6	6
8013	Shoe repairer	6	5
8024	Shoe sewer and machinist	6	6
4511	Shop assistant	6	4
3211	Shorthand and dictaphone typist	4	4
7731	Slaughterman	5	4
1639	Social worker	3	3
1929	Sociologist	2	2
4517	Spare-parts salesman	5	5
0795	Speech therapist	3	2

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
7521	Spinner and weaver - wool	6	6
6245	Station hand sheep	6	6
0810	Statistician	2	2
4435	Stock and station agent	4	3
3912	Stock clerk	5	5
3913	Storekeeper, storeroom clerk	5	5
4521	Street vendor	6	6
7720	Sugar processor and refiner	7	6
0613	Surgeon (specialist)	1	1
9854	Tanker, lorry driver	6	5
7613	Tanner, currier and dryer	6	5.5
9851	Taxi driver, self-employed	5	5
0951	Taxi driver, on wages	5	5
1715	Teacher of singing and music	3	3
1330	Teachers' college student, primary	4	3
1320	Teachers' college student, secondary	4	3
4310	Technical salesman and service advisor	3.5	4
0342	Telecommunication's technician	3	3
8560	Telephone and telegraph installer	5	6
8572	Telephone and telegraph lineman	5	5
3801	Telephone switchboard operator	5	6
9902	Timber stacker	7	6.5
7811	Tobacco grader and blender	6	5
8321	Toolmaker	5	5
5911	Tour and travel guide	4	4
0212	Town and country planner	2	2
6283	Tractor driver	6	5.5
0294	Traffic engineer	3	2
5823	Traffic officer	3	4
3944	Travel and booking clerk	5	5
6412	Trawlerman	6	4

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
9023	Tyre retreader	6	6
5920	Undertaker and embalmer	5	4
1311	University professor	1	1
008	University student, arts faculty	4	4
0010	University student, commerce faculty	4	4
0009	University student, science faculty	4	3
4434	Urban and rural valuer	4	3.5
7961	Vehicle upholsterer	6	5.5
9906	Vehicle washer	7	7
0651	Veterinarian in private or public practice	1	1
0661	Veterinary assistant	3	4
3392	Wages clerk	5	5
5322	Waiter	5	6
5322	Waitress	6	5.5
4516	Warehouse salesman	5	5
9715	Warehouse storeman	6	6
8421	Watchmaker, self-employed	3	3
8421	Watchmaker, not self-employed	4.5	5
0225	Water and soil engineer	2	2
9711	Waterside worker	6	6
8721	Welder, general	6	5
7135	Well driller, borer	5	5
4211	Wholesale/retail sales supervisor	4	4
4001	Wholesale and warehouse manager	4	4
5522	Window cleaner	6	6
7783	Wine worker	6	5.5
5701	Women's hairdresser, self-employed	5	5
5701	Women's hairdresser, not self-employed	5.5	5
8193	Wood carver (hand tools)	5	3.5
5105	Working proprietor - cafe bar	4	5
5106	Working proprietor - catering	4	4

N. Z. S. C. O. Code No.	Occupational Title	Actual Status	Ideal Status
4102	Working proprietor - retail and shop	5	4
4101	Working proprietor - wholesale	4	4
5104	Working proprietor - restaurant	4	4
5102	Working proprietor - motel	3	4
5101	Working proprietor - hotel	4	3.5
6247	Zoo attendant	5	5.5

APPENDIX B

Instructions to subjects for Part 1 and Part 2 of the study.

Instructions to Subjects:

1. Put a tick in the appropriate box - male ☐

female ☐

2. What was the single most important basis you used in making judgements about the social standing of occupations?

The first group of subjects received the following instructions printed on a sheet of paper.

Instructions.

You will have about 15 minutes to complete the following exercise. When you have finished await further instructions.

1. Take the complete bundle of cards and sort them into seven piles. Put the occupations with the highest social standing on the space marked 1 and those with the lowest social standing on the space marked 7 and the rest on the other spaces according to their social standing.
2. After having sorted all the cards, go through the pile of cards carefully and make certain that you are satisfied with the place you have given each occupation.
   Move any card to another pile if you wish. (The cards in the pile do not have to be in any particular order. The piles do not have to be the same size.)
3. If any occupation or occupations caused you particular trouble in deciding where to place it, please add a note of explanation on the question sheet.

Then on the backboard were written the following instructions:

On receiving your 40 cards, please list the occupations on the blank sheet of paper provided. Read the instruction sheet and begin. When you have finished:

1. Write on the top right hand corner of the card on the top of each pile you have formed, the corresponding space number. For example, for those occupations placed in the space marked 1 write a 1 on the top card of the pile and so on for all the piles formed.
2. Place the numbered piles in order 1 to 7 and band them together.
3. Answer the questions on the question sheet.

Part 2 of the task then began and the following instructions for this were written on the board.

1. Beside each of the occupations you listed earlier write a 1 for those occupations you think ought to have the highest social standing and so on to 7 for those you think ought to have the lowest social standing.

   If any occupation caused you trouble in deciding where to place it, please add a note of explanation alongside.
2. What was the single most important basis you used in making judgements about the social standing of occupations? - Record your answer on the question sheet.

The second group of subjects received the following set of instructions printed on a sheet of paper:

Instructions.

You will have about 15 minutes to complete the following exercise. When you have finished await further instructions.

1. Take the complete bundle of cards and sort them into seven piles. Put the occupations you think ought to have the highest social standing on the space marked 1 and those you think ought to have the lowest social standing on the space marked 7 and the rest on the other spaces according to the social standing they ought to have.
2. After having sorted all the cards, go through each pile of cards carefully and make certain that you are satisfied with the place you have given each occupation.

Move any other card to another pile if you wish. (The cards in the pile do not have to be in any particular order. The piles do not have to be the same size.)

3. If any particular occupation or occupations caused you any particular trouble in deciding where to place it, please make a note of explanation on the question sheet.

Then the following instructions were written on the blackboard. The instructions were the same as for the first group of subjects except for part two of the exercise where the instructions were:

Part 2.

1. Beside each of the occupations you listed earlier write a 1 for those occupations given the highest social standing in the community, a 2 for those given the next highest social standing and so on to 7 for those given the lowest social standing. If any occupation caused you trouble in deciding where to place it, please add a note of explanation alongside.
2. What was the single most important basis you used in making judgements about the social standing of occupations? - Record your answer on the question sheet.